

who have struggled to build up from nothing, their grandparents having lived in abject poverty as a result of the Civil War and World War I.

You are probably working for votes, but we are pleading for our very lives, for a chance to live in peace with a race that through the greed of Northern white men were brought to this section and resulted in one tragic war. They are free to go to other States, if our individual State laws do not please them. Why take away again the freedom of the white man in those States where the white man has borne the burden of the colored race all these years, and at a time when together, we are making progress in health, education, and all ways of life? In the name of all Southern womanhood, of mothers of veterans of past wars, and those wars that may result from your wasting time in causing disunity when we need unity, here and abroad, I plead with you to leave to each State those rights of local self-government as guaranteed to them, and get on with legislation that rightfully belongs to you, and is so needed to make the world safe for our generation, and for generations to come.

AN AMERICAN MOTHER FROM THE SOUTH.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, since I cannot finish tonight, and since tomorrow I am compelled to leave and cannot be present for the next few days, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for the next 3 days, or until next Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I express the hope that during the time I am compelled to be absent from the Senate there will be no vote on the pending motion, and I hope there will not be any cloture petition filed or a vote taken on any action which may result from such cloture petition, because I want to be present to vote on the question.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

SECRETARY, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Llewellyn M. Williams to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be advised of the confirmation at once.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO CLOTURE PETITION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to notify the Members of the Senate that when we recess today we will recess until the usual hour of 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, and there will be another night session on the pending question.

I may add that today we have circulated a petition for cloture to be filed on the motion to take up the pending

measure, which is the amendment to the cloture rule. It now appears that probably sometime tomorrow afternoon the petition for cloture will be filed.

I merely make this announcement in order that Senators may know about it. We must get along with the business of the Senate, and it seems to me that after the length of time that has been spent in debating the issue, the time has now arrived when we must ascertain exactly where we are going with respect to the cloture petition.

I am not saying that what I have suggested will be done tomorrow, but from the number of signatures we have upon the petition for cloture, it seems very probable that we will file it sometime tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the able Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator realizes that there is a difference of opinion as to whether the motion to take up is the pending measure.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that there is quite a difference of opinion as to whether or not the motion to take up is subject to cloture, and no doubt the Senator from Georgia will make the point of order at the proper time.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator stated it was "the pending measure." I did not want to leave the impression that the entire Senate agrees that that is the case.

Mr. LUCAS. It is part of the pending measure, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, in the interpretation of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 9 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

SECRETARY, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Llewellyn M. Williams, to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whom power and pity blend, who dost give us all things, restrain us from evil impulses and wrongdoing. Create in us new instincts, new desires, new powers of thought and feeling and will. As we stand before a righteous and a just God, may we dare to do the right, conscious that our works do follow us.

Keep in our minds that we are made in Thine image and Thy judgments will ever hold us to a strict accounting for the deeds done this day and every day. O lead us on in the ways of Christian manhood and womanhood, firm in the triumph of faith, the dominion of hope, and the ruggedness of courage. We humbly pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 82):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Sol Bloom, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

Pursuant to the above resolution, Mr. WAGNER and Mr. IVES were appointed on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes.

THE LATE WASHINGTON J. MCCORMICK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal regret that I inform the House this morning of the passing of a former colleague and a predecessor of mine in the House of Representatives. Mrs. Cora Quast McCormick, wife of former Congressman Washington J. McCormick, who represented the First Montana District from 1921 to 1923, called me on the phone yesterday afternoon to tell me of her husband's passing. I know there are very few Members of the House today who served with Washington McCormick, but there are some old-timers who will recall the sterling service which he rendered on behalf of his constituents and the people of the United States as a whole.

Washington McCormick came of a pioneer Montana family. He was born in Missoula, Mont., on January 4, 1884. He attended the public schools in Missoula, the University of Montana, and the University of Notre Dame. He was gradu-

ated from Harvard in 1906. After that he attended the Law Department of Columbia, graduating from there in 1910. He was admitted to the New York bar in 1910, returned to Montana and was admitted to the Montana bar in 1911.

He engaged in the practice of law in the State of Montana. He was a member of the State house of representatives from 1918 to 1920 before being elected to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

I wish at this time to extend my most sincere condolences to Mrs. McCormick. We of Montana will miss her husband greatly because of his fine character, and his great contribution to the development of our State.

He was a good man who unselfishly served Montana and the Nation. A captain in the Army of the United States in World War I, he served his country in an industrial capacity in World War II. Only age kept him out of the armed forces in the late struggle but even that could not stop him from doing his share wherever and whenever he found the opportunity to do so.

Yes, Washington J. McCormick is gone from among us. But, the accomplishments which were his remain and the memories of his friendship will linger long after his body is laid to rest. His frankness, humor, and sagacity have endeared him to us and we will think of him lovingly in the years ahead.

May his soul rest in peace.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the *Journal of Commerce*, New York, under date of March 8, 1949, relative to keeping the FDIC an independent agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Brown of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a statement relative to the Calumet-Sag Channel.

Mr. GRANAHAH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an article appearing in the *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* in five instances and include excerpts.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD*.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* in two instances and include letters and articles.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit while general debate is in progress during today's session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit while general debate is in progress during today's session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST TRIALS

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Holy Name Society of the Buffalo diocese and an editorial appearing in the *New York Times*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, it is just 1 month today that I stood in the well of the House to protest the infamous trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. At the time I said it was not so much that it was a high dignity of the Catholic Church that was being prosecuted and persecuted; it could have been some dignity of some other denominational faith. That has now come to pass where the Communist-controlled Government of Bulgaria has arrested ruthlessly 15 ministers of the Protestant denominations and sentenced these men. I am raising my voice in protest here at this ruthless war on religious freedom by these satellite nations. Certainly this House of Representatives should take some action in voicing its protest against all these infamous trials.

Reports from reliable sources indicate that these ministers were ruthlessly arrested, incarcerated, drugged, and tortured so they would confess to things in which they had not participated.

This is a campaign on the part of anti-religious forces to destroy religion and religious freedom not only in these Communist-controlled countries of Europe, but throughout the world. Certainly then, these antireligious forces are not only on the rampage to destroy religion and religious freedom but to destroy democratic nations throughout the world.

This apparently is their program and it remains for us, a democratic nation, believing in the great principles of freedom of religion, speech, the press, and

all other freedoms to become alert to this great menace that exists and to combat it by asking the President of the United States and the State Department to file a strong formal protest with these Communist-controlled governments, which are carrying on this vicious campaign to destroy religion and the freedoms of all peoples, and to invoke economic sanctions if possible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an editorial from the *Boston Traveler*, advocating a reduction in excise taxes.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD*.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a letter from Dr. Raver, the Bonneville Power Administrator.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* on the Missouri Valley Authority, and further to extend his remarks and include a survey on the closed shop by Rogers Dunn.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a letter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a statement by David Lawrence on the subject Nonstop B-50 Flight Demonstrates Need for a Big Army and Navy.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* in two instances, and to include in one a speech by Henry J. Taylor over the radio entitled "Keep Uncle Sam Solvent," together with questions sent him by mail and his answers, and in the other an article entitled "Mr. Farmer, the Wage Law Hits You Too!—Aimed at the Factories It Goes Through to the Farms!" I do not know who the author is but I certainly approve what the gentleman who wrote it says.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

NAVY VESSELS LOANED TO RUSSIA

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from former Secretary of the Navy Forrestal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, we were all pleased to learn that after 5 years under the Red flag of Russia, the U. S. S. light cruiser *Milwaukee* is back under the American flag again.

If that ship could talk, I wonder what it would have to say about life under the hammer and sickle.

The question the administration should now answer for the American

public, is: When will the other 580 Navy vessels we loaned to Russia be returned?

That the Members may have readily available a list of the ships we turned over to Russia, there is quoted below a letter from then Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, dated April 30, 1947, in which 581 ships are listed, together with the dates on which they were turned over to Russian custody:

| Type | Number | Dates |
|---|--------|--------------------------------------|
| AG (river tugs) | 15 | Aug. 21, 1944 through Apr. 11, 1945. |
| AM (mine sweepers) | 34 | June 25, 1943 through Aug. 17, 1945. |
| LCIL (landing craft, infantry) | 30 | June 10, 1945 through July 29, 1945. |
| PF (frigate) | 28 | July 13, 1945 through Sept. 4, 1945. |
| SC (submarine chasers, 110-foot) | 78 | July 13, 1943 through Sept. 2, 1945. |
| BPT (motor torpedo boat) | 8 | Feb. 8, 1944 through Feb. 16, 1945. |
| LCT (landing craft, tank) | 17 | Apr. 15, 1945 through May 26, 1945. |
| PT (motor torpedo boat) | 194 | Feb. 15, 1943 through Aug. 30, 1945. |
| YMS (motor mine sweepers) | 43 | Mar. 31, 1945 through Sept. 2, 1945. |
| YR (floating workshops) | 4 | June 19, 1945 through July 29, 1945. |
| PTC (submarine chasers) | 26 | Dec. 8, 1943 through Aug. 13, 1944. |
| LCM (3) (land craft, mechanized) | 54 | June 7, 1943 through Dec. 30, 1944. |
| RPC (submarine chasers) | 36 | Dec. 3, 1943 through Mar. 4, 1944. |
| Motor launch | 1 | Oct. 19, 1944. |
| Plane personnel boat | 1 | Mar. 15, 1945. |
| LCS (S) (landing craft, support) | 2 | Dec. 30, 1944. |
| LCVP (landing craft, vehicle and personnel) | 2 | Do. |
| CR (ice breaker) | 3 | Feb. 25, 1944 through Mar. 24, 1945. |
| 250-ton pontoon barges | 4 | Jan. 10, 1945 through Oct. 15, 1945. |
| CL (light cruiser) | 1 | Apr. 20, 1944. |

With exception of the light cruiser (formerly the U. S. S. *Milwaukee*) all the above-listed craft are subject to return to the United States not later than the termination of the present wars. The light cruiser is on loan to the U. S. S. R. and is subject to return upon implementation of the terms of the Italian peace treaty.

Very truly yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Let us hope they come back to us soon, and in condition so they can rejoin their sister ships under the Stars and Stripes.

MINORITY VIEWS ON RENT-CONTROL BILL

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] be permitted to file minority views on the Housing and Rent Act of 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider the rent-control bill. I have some facts which I should like the House to consider as we approach this difficult problem.

At least 2,850,000 apartments and other rental-housing units have been added to the Nation's nonfarm housing supply since 1940. Melvin H. Baker, chairman of the Construction Industry Information Committee, stated Saturday.

Nevertheless, there are now 760,000 fewer rental units and 4,600,000 fewer persons living in rental accommodations than in 1940, because in the 9 years more than 3,000,000 units, mostly single-family houses, have

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 30, 1947.
Hon ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCRIVNER: As requested in your letter of April 17, 1947, the following is a list, by type, of ships, boats, barges, and/or floating drydocks of the Navy transferred to the U. S. S. R., together with inclusive dates on which transfer was made:

been purchased for occupancy by new owners and thus have left the rental supply.

This unprecedented reduction in the number of rental units is attributed principally to the fact that many owners preferred to sell their properties rather than continue to operate them under rent controls.

This trend is a reversal of the customary pattern of the past, by which older single-family dwellings were frequently transferred from owner-occupancy to rental use.

Of the 2,850,000 rental units added to our supply since 1940, about 1,500,000 units have been created by remodeling of existing structures to provide additional units. About 750,000 units were provided with public funds in the war and postwar emergency housing programs, and 600,000 units were in new rental construction financed with private funds.

This decade has been the greatest period of housing production ever known, surpassing even the former all-time record years of the 1920's. But, in contrast, privately financed new rental construction has been at the rate of less than 70,000 units a year, compared with 350,000 units a year from 1923 to 1927.

The decline of rental units in the face of our tremendous total residential production is an abnormal and unprecedented situation.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIVERS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object; would the distinguished majority leader inform us as to the program for the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill is the first order of business today. Then there are the several bills which were on the program for yesterday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the appropriation bill comes first?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and I am hopeful that we can dispose of that program today because I understand there is not much opposition to any of the bills, or at least that is my information. In any event the rent-control bill will come up tomorrow for general debate and will be continued under the 5-minute rule on Friday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There being 5 hours' general debate, we will consume about 6 hours on that tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, there will be 1 hour on the rule; I suppose my distinguished friend has that in mind. If the bill is not disposed of on Friday, I will be constrained, however reluctantly, to go into a Saturday session. If the bill is disposed of on Friday, then we will adjourn over until Monday. Tomorrow I will confer with the gentleman from Massachusetts about coming in Friday at 11 o'clock to take the bill up under the 5-minute rule. I always like to adjourn from Friday to Monday whenever it is possible and the House has always co-operated whenever there has been such a full program, because the Members are exceedingly busy in their offices, and it gives them an opportunity to catch up with their mail and performing the many other duties in the performance of their work.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection to meeting on Saturday if it is necessary.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have made that statement because it is necessary that the rent bill be disposed of, and I hope it will be disposed of by Friday.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is being done to cut down on these appropriation bills that are coming up, so that the taxpayers of this country can get some relief from the great burdens that are being imposed upon them?

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend is a very prominent and powerful Member when it comes to appropriations.

Mr. RICH. I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations. They would not have me on that committee because if I were a member of it I would cut the heart out of some of these appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related

independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be divided between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3333, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the annual appropriation bill for fiscal year 1950 for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the National Mediation Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board.

First, I would like to pay tribute to the members of the subcommittee. In the 9 years I have been a Member of this honorable body I have yet to see a committee that has been more diligent than this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency.

We held hearings on the bill for several weeks, and there was seldom a time when a single member of the subcommittee was absent.

I pay particular tribute to my colleagues on the Democratic side, the able gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK, and the able gentleman from New York, Judge McGRATH, for the valuable assistance they gave me during these weeks of hearings.

I want also to pay tribute to the members of the minority, including the former chairman of this subcommittee and ranking member on the minority side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], for the support and cooperation they gave to me while these hearings were in progress.

I would like to pay special tribute to our very able and conscientious clerk, Paul Wilson, who we were so fortunate to have as clerk for this committee. Without his help and support we would not have been able to report this bill today. He has been a monument of strength to every member of the committee in helping us to bring this appropriation bill to the floor today.

This is a very difficult and complex bill. In my opinion, it is one of the most important appropriation bills that will come before this House this year. It embraces many and varied programs. I am very happy to say that the mem-

bership of this committee, although we may disagree on some items in the bill, are generally in agreement. Some of the members felt that some appropriations should have been increased more than the Bureau of the Budget allowed, and we have done that in three or four instances. Some of us might have felt that some of the increases that we have allowed should have been in lesser amounts. Some of the members may feel that some of the requests that were allowed by the Bureau of the Budget should have been decreased, but in the over-all, I think I can safely say that we are fairly well in agreement on the the recommendations in this bill.

The bill carries total direct appropriations of \$2,211,794,085, which is an increase of \$353,838,775 over what has been appropriated for the fiscal year 1949 to date, but is a reduction of \$23,271,600 under the Budget estimates. The increase over 1949 appropriations to date does not take account of substantial additional funds now pending in the first deficiency bill. I hope you will follow the report as we go along in this discussion, because it is a very comprehensive and well-prepared report that explains and covers practically every item in the bill, and shows in detail comparisons with the estimates and the current year.

The first portion of the bill relates to the Labor Department itself. On page 42 of the report there is a breakdown of the appropriations for the Labor Department, and you will notice in the last column a decrease in the amount of \$216,200. This represents a supplemental request sent up for the International Labor Affairs Office after we had concluded regular hearings on the bill. Although we held hearings for part of a day on this supplemental item, we did not feel we had sufficient knowledge to determine whether or not this was necessary at this time, and thus to justify granting it without further consideration, and so we have excluded it from the bill. But in all the other items for the Department of Labor we have recommended the full amount allowed by the Budget. In total, the Department has available this year, fiscal year 1949, \$14,373,150, and we are allowing them for fiscal 1950, \$16,550,000, or an increase of \$2,176,850 over what they had for fiscal year 1949. About \$991,000 of that increase is for Public Law 900 pay-raise costs.

The largest single increase in the bill for the Department of Labor is for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, \$1,441,452; and the largest item in that increase is for the collection of statistics on employment, hours, and earnings, on a State basis, and for selected industries, which will be a very comprehensive program in the future. It is supposed to eliminate duplication of collection of statistics from employers as has happened on occasion in the past. It will in effect permit the sending of but one form to an employer for reporting all these statistics, whereas in the past the employers have been bothered by having to fill out several forms. So it is our hope that by the inclusion of this item we will eliminate

a duplication that has been going on in the past in the matter of the collection of important statistics on employment, hours, earnings, and so forth, by or through the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The increase also includes additional funds for strengthening the whole-sale-price index and the cost-of-living index which have such wide usage. It will also provide for needed building construction statistics which are not available at the present time. We hope that with this and the other items of appropriation the Department of Labor will be more able to function as a real department next year.

My statement that this is a very difficult and complex bill is borne out by the portion dealing with the Federal Security Agency. For this Agency alone the budget estimates of direct appropriations are \$1,501,481,985. Of that amount \$1,372,655,260, or 91½ percent, represents items, which, for the most part, we cannot touch. In other words we cannot materially reduce the expenditures involved in these items which include grants and benefits to States and others of various kinds. Many of the amounts represent mandatory grants as, for example, the public-assistance grants which for the first time in history has reached a total of \$1,058,000,000. For vocational rehabilitation there is \$20,500,000. The unemployment-compensation and employment services grants are \$135,000,000 in cash. For vocational education, \$19,842,760. The Employees' Compensation Bureau, \$13,000,000. The Children's Bureau receives annually for grants to the States, \$22,000,000. The Public Health Service estimate of grants is \$88,653,000. Another general category is for hospitals that we have to appropriate for, which are mainly marine hospitals, and the estimates of total appropriation for them are \$29,519,789, or 2 percent of the over-all Federal security figure. In order to operate the educational institutions it takes \$2,650,000, or two-tenths of 1 percent.

The construction program at Howard University, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and at Bethesda, Md., that we have embarked upon in the past 3 or 4 years included in this bill is mostly for past contract authorizations and the estimates for those are \$25,928,425, or 1.7 percent of the over-all bill.

So, all in all, in the Federal Security appropriations that we have before us today, involving estimates of about \$1,500,000,000, 95.4 percent represents items in which we could not show substantial savings; we have made reductions, however, wherever we could. We only have 4.6 percent of that sum, or about \$69,000,000, to operate on and in which to make other cuts. We have made cuts wherever we felt justified in doing so under all the circumstances.

As I say, we have cut some of the items in the Federal Security Agency, but there are three notable exceptions where we have gone beyond the figures allowed by the Bureau of the Budget in the Public Health Service. On those three items the committee is unanimous in its decision, feeling that the Bureau of the Budget did not know of or perhaps fully appreciate the program that had been

started by this committee in the past 2 or 3 years and has been followed through by this committee when the Bureau of the Budget cut the request of the Public Health Service for mental-health activities, for cancer activities, and an appropriation for the National Heart Institute.

Those of you who were here a year ago will remember that this committee took the same type of action at that time under the leadership of the then chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who has been very active in this entire program in the past. At that time we went over the figures of the Bureau of the Budget in providing funds for mental-health activities, for the National Cancer Institute, and approved substantial amounts for the National Heart Institute. The latter program was given added emphasis a year ago with the passage of the National Heart Act in June 1948, by the Eightieth Congress.

As I think everyone knows, when the public-health officials appear before committees of Congress, they are obliged to justify and support the budget figures, and are not allowed to justify anything over the budget; but because of the intense interest of this committee in these three programs—mental health, heart, and cancer—it was the unanimous decision of the committee to call in some of the outstanding men in those three fields in the country. So, as a result, after consultation with the Surgeon General, we set aside 2 days of hearings to have some of these outstanding men come in and testify and give us the benefit of their experience in these fields, to see what we could do to hold these programs started a year or two ago.

These men in the mental-health field included men like Dr. Menninger, of Kansas, eminently qualified in that field; also Dr. Paul White in the heart field; and in the cancer field we had Dr. Rhoades of Memorial Hospital, N. Y., who is considered one of the outstanding men on cancer in the world today. There were others before the committee. I know, if you will read the hearings and read our report and read the testimony of these and other outstanding people who appeared before the committee, that everyone of you would be willing to vote for more than we are allowing in the bill today for these three very important programs at the present time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to commend the committee for its splendid action. I think it is a good step. I wanted to voice my approval now as well as later.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I, too approve of what the committee has done. At Ohio State University, in Columbus, Ohio, the State has made substantial appropriations for increasing the medical center, and it was hoped that there could be a construction program amounting to \$1,500,000 in con-

nection with cancer research. I note that that item was presented by Dr. Heller, and I wonder if the gentleman could tell me how much of that program could be carried out under the \$2,500,000 additional granted by the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I recall the testimony, the National Advisory Cancer Council had cleared, or had ready for clearance, about 17 projects at a cost of about \$8,688,000. We are now recommending only \$2,500,000, and it would be up to the Advisory Council and the Surgeon General to decide where the \$2,500,000 will be allocated as regards specific projects cleared by the Council.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman will recall, when the matter was under discussion before the committee, that Dr. Heller listed a number of projects which they considered to be of high priority in the construction of facilities for cancer research. They totaled about \$8,600,000, as I recall. The gentleman will also recall, I believe, that Dr. Heller testified that the National Advisory Cancer Council had not yet approved any of those projects because there were no funds presently available. What actually happened was, we have today in this bill \$2,500,000 for construction funds, and, as the gentleman from Rhode Island has stated, the National Advisory Cancer Council will determine the allocation of those funds to the projects for which applications are now pending.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I find, on page 20 of the report, a statement that—

The \$2,500,000 allocated for construction grants is firm. It is desired that the amounts for the other projects be allocated approximately as shown, but the committee wishes to point out that it has no intention or desire to so firmly earmark the breakdown as to require utilization of total resources contrary to the considered judgment of the Surgeon General based upon recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council.

Now, do I understand by that that if the committee has no intention to finally earmark funds, it has the intention that these funds shall be used as the National Advisory Cancer Council shall deem best, and not require spending a little on all of the projects, but permit them to pick specific projects if that is deemed the best way to meet the problem?

Mr. FOGARTY. I presume that will be what they will do. The reason we earmarked the \$2,500,000 as a firm item is to make sure that that amount goes into construction grants and not go anywhere else; that they allocated it for that purpose.

Mr. VORYS. It is the intention of the committee to make it firm for construction, but not to require that it be allocated for any specific project or any specific lists of projects?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; we are not attempting to tell them where to spend the money. We are leaving that up to the Advisory Council and the Surgeon General. We have the utmost faith in that Council and the decisions that have

been made by them and by the Surgeon General.

If you will refer to the report on these activities, starting on page 16 of the committee report, you will see the breakdowns we have allowed for the mental-health activities and cancer and heart research. At the bottom of page 16 you will see a table relating to funds for mental-health activities. We have allowed, in total appropriated funds for 1950, \$825,000 more than was allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for the mental-health activities, and have allowed \$2,010,000 more in contract authority for research—grants—and training—graduate and undergraduate—than the Bureau of the Budget allowed for contract authority in connection with mental-health activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

It was testified before the committee that the mental-health problem is one of the most serious problems we have to face in this country today. It was testified that about 50 percent of the hospital beds are occupied today by mentally ill patients. It was further testified that 8,500,000 people are mentally ill in this country at the present time.

I think if some of you had an opportunity to visit some State asylum run by the various States throughout this country, you would be shocked at the treatment that is being given in some States to their mentally ill. I, for one, firmly believe that something can be done to ease this situation. It is going to take time; it is going to take money; and it is going to take trained personnel. We are attempting in this bill to provide funds in the years to come, not only this year, to get the trained technicians, scientists, and other personnel we need at the present time and in the future to attempt to find out the causes of mental illness. Until we do find the causes, there is not much we can do about it. But I think when 50 percent of the hospital beds in this country are occupied today by mentally ill patients, it is about time the Federal Government took a definite step forward in attempting to find a solution to the problem of the causes of mental illness.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I asked the gentleman to yield simply so I could express a very sincere appreciation for the work the subcommittee has done on the mental-health program. I am the author of the mental-health act that passed this House a few years ago. I have watched the beginnings of that program, and have been encouraged by some of the work that has been done. I appreciate the attitude of the subcommittee in providing funds that this work may be expanded, and I say this because it is a very sincere appreciation out of the depths of my heart.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

On page 19 of the report you will find a similar break-down for the funds of the National Cancer Institute. Here again

we have exceeded the figures that were given to us by the Bureau of the Budget by \$4,400,000. The Bureau of the Budget requested \$16,100,000 in appropriation. That request was increased \$300,000. Because this is a program that has been started and implemented by this committee and the Congress in the past few years, we believe it is a going program and we have allowed the full amount which was requested by the Bureau of the Budget for the National Cancer Institute and increased the appropriated funds by \$300,000. A year ago \$8,000,000 was approved by the Congress for contract authority for cancer research construction grants. This year the Bureau of the Budget only allowed \$900,000 for forward financing research projects. We have exceeded the figure by \$4,100,000 in this field because we have made up our minds to keep this program going forward and not allow it to slip backward.

It was testified in the committee that one out of seven are dying of cancer in this country at the present time. It is the second leading cause of death. Some cases of cancer which were incurable a few years ago are being cured today because of the research that has been going on during the past 3 or 4 years. Unless we keep up that program; unless we allow contract authority for forward planning and graduate work in these schools, and for research facilities, so that we can get the proper men in this field and provide them with the facilities, we are not going to get properly trained people in this field of cancer or make progress like we should. There are hundreds and hundreds of men today who are putting their lives into this field of cancer research. If we can give them some encouragement, we believe that we can go a long, long way. That is why we have exceeded the budget by \$4,400,000, over-all.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am very much impelled to thank the gentleman for the magnificent work that his committee has done in this aspect of the budget. There is nothing that can contribute more for the encouragement of those who are working so desperately in this research field than this program of forward payment, and the refusal to submit to a cut. Those of us who have not had the privilege of working with you thank you for the work that you have done.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I say to the gentlewoman that this is not my program. This is the program of the entire Committee on Appropriations. They were unanimously in favor of this program, which was started before I became a member of the committee and which I am happy to play a part in now. Every member of the committee deserves credit for this program, because they have been unanimously in favor of it.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. I realize, of course, that the full committee had to pass on this program, but I do appreciate so much that the subcommittee went to bat for it.

Mr. FOGARTY. On page 20 you will find the same break-down for the fund

for the National Heart Institute. It is a relatively new program which has been implemented by the passage of the National Heart Act of 1948. We have increased the budget estimate for the National Heart Institute in appropriated funds by \$3,725,000, and in contract authority by \$3,220,000, or a total of \$6,945,000.

This is practically a new program. But after listening to the testimony of outstanding men in this field, we were convinced that it is one of the most necessary programs that the Federal Government can support at the present time. I believe the Members of Congress and the members of the committee today could never find any fault with this subcommittee in going over the figures of the Bureau of the Budget, especially in view of what has happened within the last 4 or 5 days when we have lost three outstanding men in this country, one a Member of this body, another a Member of the Senate, and the third a former Member of this House, the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Andrews, of New York. Those three men have passed away in the last 4 or 5 days by sudden heart attacks. I know there are those in this Congress who will say, "What can we do about it?" That has been one of my complaints in the past. There are too many who seem to take that attitude, that if you have heart trouble there is not anything to do about it except to go home and go to bed. After listening to some of the men in this field, we are convinced that something can be done about it, if we provide the necessary funds to establish various clinics, to establish a way to get trained personnel in this field, and to establish proper research facilities throughout the country. That is the principal reason why we have gone over the figures of the Bureau of the Budget in this item. The No. 1 killer of our people today is heart disease. While we have been appropriating money in past years, year in and year out, for the Public Health Service for preventive diseases, like venereal disease, tuberculosis, and others, they have found new drugs to help in the cure of those diseases. But at the same time not much had been done about heart disease. Where we have found drugs that help in these preventive diseases, the record shows the cause of death by those diseases is going down year after year, but in the case of death by heart disease, the record shows an increase in the past 10 years. Instead of leveling off we are going higher and higher and higher. I think something should be done about it.

This Congress has appropriated in the neighborhood, as I recall, of \$25,000,000 a year, or at least we did last year, to try to find out something about the hoof-and-mouth disease in cattle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

This Congress has appropriated over \$25,000,000 for research in the hoof-and-mouth disease. That is a good program, and I am for it. I voted for it. I think it is necessary. But I think if we can do

something like that we can at least not only take care of the animal industry of the country but also the human beings of this country, in an attempt to try to find out some way whereby they can have a longer and healthier life.

We are spending in the neighborhood of \$9,000,000 for Bang's disease in cattle. We are spending millions of dollars to find out what diseases affect plants and trees. I think it is about time we gave serious consideration to the ailments affecting you and me and every other human being in the country, and we are attempting to do something about it in this bill.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. I would like to join with my colleagues in commending the committee for the forward approach and the great vision they have taken in bringing forward this very comprehensive piece of legislation. In thinking about what you are spending for hoof-and-mouth disease, I am reminded that we are spending today approximately 34 cents out of every dollar paying for past wars and preparing for future wars. It seems to me we need to begin to emphasize these great social problems involving the health and education of our people. I wish to highly commend the committee for its forward approach in coming to grips with this important subject.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I would like to join in the statements made by my colleague, and to commend the committee for the appropriation act which it has produced. Like the committee, I believe the greatest natural resource which our country has is the men and women who make up this country. The millions which we are spending to save our mineral resources, forests, and other resources are very essential to the national welfare, but the funds which this committee has appropriated will do much to check and eradicate the dread scourges which are killing and crippling so many of our people. These appropriations truly recognize the need for protecting and preserving our greatest natural resource, and I am happy to support them.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is one other major change in this appropriation bill to which I shall address myself and that is the appropriation for the Bureau of Employment Security for the fiscal year 1950. I think, as perhaps most of the Members know, the funds for the employment security programs in the States have not been sufficient for this fiscal year and that the Members perhaps have received many requests from the administrators of employment security in the various States for additional funds to be granted to them in this bill. As I remember the figures of a year ago the Bureau of Employment Security requested of the Bureau of the Budget \$160,000,000 for fiscal year 1949. The Bureau of the Budget cut that request by about \$15,000,000, that is, cut it down to \$145,000,000 plus; this House cut that

request to \$123,000,000, or a further decrease of \$22,000,000; and we finally came out of conference with the sum of \$130,000,000 for the State employment security programs.

The estimate of \$135,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950 was based on work loads which it now appears certain are outdated. All of us know that unemployment has risen since last November or December, although I believe it is leveling off at the present time. I will not, however, admit that the unemployment situation today is anything to get alarmed about after reading the report of the Bureau of the Census released last week. A year ago, in February of 1948, we had employed in this country 57,200,000 people; in February of 1949, according to the figures of the Census, we had the same number of people employed, 57,200,000; but during the year 600,000 new employable people came into the labor market with no increase in available jobs; so, as a result, we have about 600,000 more unemployed today than we had a year ago, but we have exactly the same number of people employed today that we had in February of 1948.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask the gentleman how this money is allocated to the States: Is it allocated on the case load of the State? The reason I ask the question of the gentleman is that in Massachusetts last year we asked for a million more than we got. The consequence was that in October we had to lay off workers and could not take care of the work load thrust upon us. According to this report, the matter of allocation is left to somebody who does not make a proper allocation.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would not say that. The decision is left to the Director of the Employment Security Bureau, Mr. Robert C. Goodwin, who makes the various allotments. The first step is for the State to submit to the Bureau of Employment Security here in Washington a budget of what it thinks it is going to need in the next year. We all know there are indeterminate factors that cannot be foreseen with accuracy, such as the increase of the work load or the increase of unemployment; but the States make their budget and their budget is sent to Washington to be passed on by the Bureau of Employment Security. It then goes to the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Budget determines what shall be submitted for the next year. For the coming fiscal year 1950 the Bureau of Employment Security requested \$159,000,000 plus for this purpose; the Bureau of the Budget cut that request to \$135,000,000, only \$5,000,000 above what the Congress allowed them originally for 1949. In 1949 they were allowed \$130,000,000. By recent action of this House in a deficiency bill they received an additional \$10,000,000; so that, presumably, they will have available in 1949 at least \$140,000,000 instead of the original \$130,000,000.

Now, to get back to the gentleman's question, I think the committee has arrived at a common-sense solution of the

over-all problem, and if the gentleman will let me proceed for just a couple of minutes, maybe I can clarify some of the things he has in mind. We of the committee realize how difficult it is to forecast in the future what the unemployment-compensation work load is going to be in any particular State. We realize the problem that the chief of the department has in making allotments to the various States under the budget that they request. We also realize that when some States were ordered a year ago to cut down because of lack of funds from the administrative level here in Washington, they refused to cut down and take off employees at the State level, and certain difficulties arose. That has been the fault of the State in two or three instances. Every State in the Union has run short of funds and has had to lay off help in their local offices. So, this year we are attempting to do something in this bill that will help straighten out the difficulties that were experienced in connection with the deficiencies experienced last year.

A year ago it was recommended that we establish a contingency fund of 10 percent of the base appropriation. If we had done that a year ago, we would have had a contingency fund of \$13,000,000 to be used in the fiscal year 1949 to take care of this unforeseen increase in the work load that exists at the present time. We did not do that. So this year in order to overcome the situation, as we see it, we are appropriating the amount that has been allowed by the Bureau of the Budget, \$135,000,000, but we have added certain language, and if you will look on page 25 of the report, you will see the language we have added to the bill, as follows:

Provided, That during the period ending March 31, 1950, this appropriation may be apportioned and obligated at an annual rate not in excess of \$150,000,000 and, to the extent that the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from change in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the original State's grant was based, such annual rate may be increased to not in excess of \$157,500,000:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, that means, as the report explains, that they can spend in the first three-quarters of the fiscal year 1950 at an annual rate of not to exceed \$150,000,000. If this work load keeps up as it is at present they might have to spend the \$150,000,000. If they do they will have to come in for another deficiency to this Congress next spring. I do not believe the rate is going to hold up that way. In my opinion, this is an unusual situation we are in at the present time. The unemployment situation is not going to continue as it is at the present time.

Also a year ago we wanted to establish some sort of a contingency fund to offset certain of these increases in State salaries that we could not foresee and

that the State people and Federal security could not foresee. So we have set out in the language of the bill, "To the extent that the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, finds it necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from change in a State law or increases in the number of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the original State's grant was based, such annual rate may be increased to not in excess of \$157,500,000."

This means that we are establishing a contingency reserve of 5 percent of the basic maximum annual rate of \$150,000,000, or \$7,500,000, that can be used for those purposes, if need be, under the conditions stated.

We have high hopes that in the near future after this contingency fund has had a chance to work we will eliminate the need for coming back to the Congress each time for a deficiency. Another thing we will be doing by granting this contingency fund is this: In the past the Employment Security Director has been able to make these grants on only a semi-annual basis. The State people have found fault with that, and I think they have had some reason to find fault with it, but we have the assurance of Mr. Goodwin, Director of Employment Security, that if they are granted a contingency fund he will be able to allocate the funds on a yearly basis in the coming year; therefore I think that this is a common-sense approach to the over-all problem, which is very difficult to determine on a realistic dollar basis so far in advance as we normally have to do in this Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With those increased provisions which go beyond anything ever provided for, if I understand the gentleman, the States then will have to submit their budgets to the headquarters down here and then let the headquarters here work out through contingency funds and such additional appropriations as the Congress might make, to meet the load that may develop. That is what the program would be.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have talked much longer than I anticipated on this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. My people in Texas, who are responsible for the administration of the George-Barden Act, have indicated that they were very short of money this last year, yet in the hearings, on page 110, it shows there was approximately \$1,000,000 unexpended under this act. Does that mean that the \$1,000,000 of the approximately \$19,000,000 that was appropriated was not used?

Mr. FOGARTY. The total for fiscal 1948 was mentioned in the hearings. I do not recall the precise amount.

Mr. TEAGUE. It shows Texas has an unexpended balance of about \$28,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know the total offhand, but there were some funds in the various States that were not used by the States. That is a matching fund item, and I would say that that would be the answer. But, we have had several requests for increasing this appropriation which is authorized by law to go up to \$29,301,000 plus. There are a lot of things in this bill on which we would like to go over the budget request but we have to stop somewhere. So, we have allowed only the same that they had last year for the George-Barden program.

We have one new appropriation in the bill, for the water pollution program, and we have allowed practically what the Bureau of the Budget called for. There is \$1,000,000 in grants to States. They asked for \$1,380,000 for Public Health Service salaries and expenses, and we have reduced that by \$380,000. But, we have been assured that this program authorized a year ago will not be hurt in any way by that reduction.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is perhaps the ninth time that I have appeared in the well of the House to discuss this particular appropriation. I elected to stay upon this particular subcommittee because I love the work. I want to say that in all the years that I have been upon this subcommittee I never have appreciated or enjoyed it more than this year. It has been a delightful experience to see such unanimity of thinking on the part of the members of this committee, and such a splendid approach manifested by the three new members of the committee who have taken such a great interest in the welfare of this country as evidenced in the appropriations made under this bill. I want to thank the chairman for his uniform fairness and courtesy. I have tried to be of such help as I could in aiding in the conduct of these hearings, in order that the Members would have the information at hand on the subjects with which this bill deals.

I want the House to know that both the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEENRICK] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] have shown great interest and have made every effort to understand the very complicated appropriation items that are contained in this bill. I feel tremendously relieved to have as one of the minority members of this committee the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], who always, out of his very clear thinking and his good mind, puts his finger exactly on the point at issue and is at all times trying to see if it is not possible to reduce appropriations and expenditures of money to ease the tax burden upon the people of America.

We are confronted with a peculiar situation and always have been under this bill. Just think of it: The little appropriation that is required to maintain the Department of Labor is puny and infinitesimal compared with the amounts we appropriate for the Federal Security Agency. The Venereal Disease Control Division of the Public Health Service alone spends more money than the entire

Department of Labor in its activities. I use that just as an illustration to show the situation with which we are confronted in this bill.

In this bill you have the appropriation for railroad retirement. The law states that the railroad workers and the carriers shall contribute into the Public Treasury for the maintenance of the railroad retirement program, and we have to appropriate that money to them and have nothing to say about it. The law requires it to be done. It runs into hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars.

You have all the appropriations for the Bureau of Public Assistance, that matches the State funds in the grants under the social-security law, for old-age assistance, for maternal and child-welfare aid, for aid to crippled children, and for aid to the blind. This year for the first time in the history of this Congress the amount of Federal aid for matching funds under the various titles of the Social Security Act reached the astounding total of \$1,058,000,000.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. On the very point the gentleman is discussing, public assistance, it is stated on page 32 of the bill that the appropriation is for grants to States for old-age assistance and dependent children. I do not find any place, either in the report of the committee or the hearings, where any of these States repay to the Federal Government any portion of the grant they receive. Am I correct in that?

Mr. KEEFE. What does the gentleman mean, repay it to the Federal Government?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. They do not pay back to the Federal Government any portion of any grant they receive.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course; it is a matching-fund program. They do not pay it back.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I wonder whether the committee knows that there are States that receive this grant, but, when a citizen applies for old-age assistance or for aid to dependent children, the State requires the signing of a restitution bond or agreement, and upon the death of the recipient of the old-age assistance the State levies against the estate and collects that money back, but does not account to the Federal Government for any portion of the money it collects.

Mr. KEEFE. I say to the gentleman that he is entirely in error with respect to that. That is not a fact. I have gone into that question at length, year after year, and it is a fact that is pretty well known, that the Federal Government does not require, in the administration of social security, that any State law shall require liens against the homes of beneficiaries. That is entirely a matter of State law.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. But when an old-age pensioner, for example, who lived in a State which requires a lien to be filed against his or her home, dies, and the State takes that property over and sells it in order to realize a benefit under their

lien and to recover the amount of money that has been paid, the Federal Government shares in the distribution of those funds just as the State does.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Does the report show where the Government does receive the benefits? I have not been able to find it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman can take that matter up with the Social Security Administration. I do not know whether it is shown this year in the tables, but it has been shown year after year. You will find out the exact amount that comes back to the Federal Government as its share of the recoveries under such social-security legislation. I know that is a fact, because I have gone into it. The matter has been raised time and time again in years past.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Referring to the \$1,058,000,000 set forth on page 52 of the report and the \$715,889,000 on the Railroad Retirement Agency on page 53 of the committee report, as I understand it, the Congress appropriated those funds. Was the \$715,889,000 paid into the Federal Treasury by the railroads and the railroad employees?

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It was paid in?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; that is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Likewise, what portion of the \$1,058,000,000 was paid in under social security? What portion of that was paid into the Federal Treasury?

Mr. KEEFE. None of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. None of it?

Mr. KEEFE. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the \$1,058,000,000 is a direct appropriation and a burden on the taxpayers?

Mr. KEEFE. The \$1,058,000,000 is a direct burden on the Treasury of the United States to provide matching funds under the social-security law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. While the \$715,889,000 is an indirect burden paid in by the railroads and their employees?

Mr. KEEFE. That would fall in the same category as the appropriation for old-age and survivors' insurance. Under that program, the employee pays into the Treasury 1 percent of his wage and the employer pays in 1 percent of the pay roll. The total thus paid into the Treasury is then appropriated to the trust fund of the OASI. It falls in the same category. There is nothing that can be done about it. It has to be done under the law. What I am leading to with reference to that point and what I am trying to demonstrate, as I have in years past, is that people come in and say, "Here is a bill covering two-billion-two-hundred-and-thirty-million-odd dollars. That is a lot of money. Why do you not cut these appropriations? You ought to be able to cut off 25 percent or 10 percent or 15 percent." Or they quote some other theoretical percentage. But they lose sight of the fact that with this particular bill we have a very limited field in which the Committee on Appropriations can operate. In fact, I believe, of the appropriated funds carried in this bill, about 93 percent or 94 percent, or even 95 percent,

is in the category that you cannot touch unless you want to default and destroy the very programs that you have put upon the statute books, such as the railroad retirement and social-security programs.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not like to correct the gentleman, but the funds of the Railroad Retirement Board are not covered into the Treasury. They are carried in a trust fund, the gross amount of which is something in the neighborhood of \$7,000,000,000. Transfers are made from the trust fund to railroad retirement appropriations; is that not correct?

Mr. KEEFE. The chairman will be glad to answer that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is correct. We put it into the general Treasury and then we appropriate to the trust fund.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure the gentleman will find there is a trust fund—

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, there is a trust fund. The appropriation we are talking about is appropriated out of the Treasury to that trust fund. The trust fund under social security represents billions of dollars. They have a trust fund under the Railroad Retirement Act, just as they have a trust fund under unemployment compensation, and just as they have a trust fund for old-age and survivors' insurance; but under the Constitution of the United States that money has to be paid first into the Treasury of the United States and we make an absolute appropriation of the total amount out of the Treasury to the trust fund for railroad retirement of the amounts that have been paid in both by the workers and the carriers. That is my understanding of the law. That goes to a trust fund, and that trust fund is managed by the Railroad Retirement Board in the payment of annuities.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In reading the report on the bill, under "Grants for hospital construction," I wish the gentleman would explain how a hospital can qualify for aid under this section of the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. I would be glad to make an explanation on that. I think every State in the Union understands that each State may receive aid under the provision of the Hill-Burton Act; that is the Hospital Construction Act. Under that law every State has set up a hospital authority. That is a State authority, operating under the jurisdiction and direction, in most States, of the State public health service. That local State authority makes a survey of their particular State and determines the necessity for hospital beds in that State. They determine the priority, whether it shall be this type or that type of hospital, whether the hospital ought to be located here or there. That is all a matter for the determination of the local State hospital authority. A local village or city or community that is interested in build-

ing a hospital and wants to get funds under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act does not make its application to Washington. It makes its application to its own State authority, and that authority lists all of those applications and determines, as I say, the necessity and the priority under which the construction will take place. They then recommend approved projects here to Washington, and on those approved projects, for which funds are made available by the Congress each year under the Hill-Burton Act, \$75,000,000, the Washington office administering that law approves that project which has been initiated and which has been approved and presented by the State, and we furnish \$1 for each \$2 raised by the State or the local authority. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Except for this: Can a philanthropic body, not connected with a city or county or municipal government, apply for a grant?

Mr. KEEFE. Of course. Any eleemosynary institution or institution operated for nonprofit purposes is eligible to receive the benefits of the Hill-Burton Construction Act. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. McDONOUGH. It does. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to answer any questions with respect to this bill because the details are so multitudinous that you just cannot within the time limits attempt to cover all of these items. The chairman has done that very well.

Mr. FOGARTY. One thing I did not cover was that we failed to make appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board and the Conciliation and Mediation Service.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the report indicates that heretofore this bill has carried appropriation estimates for the National Labor Relations Board and the Conciliation Service. You will not find them in the bill. Action has been deferred pending action by the Eighty-first Congress, which has not yet taken place, and we do not know what that Eighty-first Congress is going to do.

That sort of leads me to rather a little bit of talk that I think we ought to discuss a little in connection with this matter. I do not want to throw any cold water on the spirit of harmony that has been manifested here, but I cannot help thinking of last year and the year before, when I was charged with the responsibility of presenting this bill to the Congress; what a belaboring I received from the Democratic side. Oh, how well I remember how we were charged with destroying the Department of Labor. Do you remember it? I have the speeches right here. I do not want to rub any salt in any old wounds, but I recall the speeches that were made, and I had to bear the brunt of that criticism. I want to tell you that I worried along with it for 2 years. I know how an assistant of the Labor Department came out into my State and charged the Eighty-first Congress, the "do nothing" Congress, with destroying the Labor Department because of cutting off its funds; and I remember how he charged that I, as the chairman of that subcommittee, was re-

sponsible for stabbing labor in the back and all that sort of tripe. I notice he has just resigned, in disgust perhaps, because he was not appointed Under Secretary of Labor; I do not know what else; but he and plenty of others reiterated that stuff to the American people, and they did it here on this floor, and they pointed out how we had cut this appropriation and cut that appropriation, and how we had destroyed labor. Do you remember that? Some of you new Members who are here for the first time, who came in on that platform perhaps, and the promise that you and the Eighty-first Congress were going to take care of it; you were going to restore the Labor Department, and you would show this miserable Eightieth Congress a thing or two; you would show them a trick with a hole in it; you would put these funds back. What have you done? Well, you have done absolutely nothing up to date, absolutely nothing; and we have been here two months and a half. You have not done anything.

I know what the temptation is to talk politics on this floor; I know what it is; I know what the temptation is to go out and talk politics to the people of the country, but are you not just a little bit ashamed now that you realize the facts and the truth? Are you not a little bit ashamed for the way you misled the people—or at least tried to mislead them—you went out and paraded this information that the Eightieth Congress had destroyed the Labor Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Now, let us look at the picture. We get into a very interesting subject here now and one that I think ought to be canvassed just a little bit on this floor. I am glad to say that my friends on the majority side of this committee this year perhaps looked at the recommendations of their President and his Bureau of the Budget with very great alarm when they discovered that in actuality and in fact the Bureau of the Budget accepted almost in toto the action of the Eightieth Congress so far as appropriations for the Department of Labor were concerned. Where is all this restoration of funds? Where is all this pledge that you were going to see that the Department of Labor was built up, and that you were going to give them all the money they asked for? Is it in this bill? Go back and tell the people what you have been doing; tell them the truth. If you tell them the truth you will find that the Eightieth Congress did a pretty good job, because the President himself and his Bureau of the Budget put their seal of approval on what the Eightieth Congress did when they submitted a budget estimate this year with only an increase, a total increase as between the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress and the bill suggested here, of only \$2,176,850.

What makes that increase possible and necessary? Why, \$991,000 of it represents salary increases that the Eightieth Congress gave to employees of the Labor Department and other agencies of government which became effective last August. Do you remember that?

You are so interested in these employees and doing things for labor. But the Eightieth Congress gave these employees a pay increase last August. Of the total increase in this bill for the Labor Department for 1950, \$991,000 of it is accounted for by that pay-increase law.

That leaves \$1,185,850 and of that amount \$1,129,000 of the increase is for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Do you remember what happened on this floor last year? The committee recommended an appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics and that was cut down by virtue of an amendment adopted on the floor of the House. The amount of the increase that the Bureau of the Budget gives in this bill to the Bureau of Labor Statistics is practically the same amount as the committee last year gave before action was taken on the floor of the House. You are getting just about the same amount that a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Eightieth Congress gave to the Labor Department in total, the total increase being \$56,850.

Now, that is the great mouse you have developed as a result of this yelling and hollering as to what the Eighty-first Congress was going to do for the Labor Department. When you are charged with the responsibility as we were last year, and you are charged with a responsibility that compels you to look facts in the face as the Bureau of the Budget did and as the President did, you will find that the Eightieth Congress did a pretty good job and you cannot improve very much on it.

That leads me to another thing.

Do you remember the editorials and the wails that went around when the subcommittee last year, and there was great force behind it, wrote a lot of legislation into the appropriation bill to streamline the Federal Security Agency? Do you remember that? Do you remember the wails that went up? I remember one article after another published in the papers of my State, vicious articles, which said that I was responsible for destroying the social-security program. Right here on this floor it was said that if the Congress accepts the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin and his subcommittee it will destroy the social-security program. Do you remember that? Oh, how I suffered under that.

Are you not a little bit ashamed of yourselves now? Are you not really ashamed of yourselves?

Now, read the record. The thing has been in operation now for a year. Do you believe Oscar Ewing, head of the Federal Security Agency? He is your boy. Do you believe Bob Goodwin, head of the Employment Service? He is your boy. Read their statements in this record. It is crystal clear that the thing is working magnificently and all this talk about what you were going to do to social security, the USES, the UC, and all that sort of thing was just a lot of boloney thrown out for pure, dirty, nasty political purposes. I want to rub your nose into it, good naturedly. I want to call to the attention of the American people how you fooled them.

Now listen, and I want you to get this. When Mr. Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, was before the committee I asked him this question which you will find on page 739 of the hearings:

Mr. Ewing, first of all I want to compliment you and the agency in carrying out and accelerating, if I may use that word, the program which this committee set out for you to do with the intent of strengthening the top administration of this agency and streamlining the operations in the field. If I interpret your statement correctly, the proposal for the consolidation of the various and sundry field offices of the constituent unit agencies into the Federal Security Agency regional office set-up, with the top-flight regional director, and the people under him representing the staffing arrangement at the headquarters here, has proven to be an efficient and satisfactory step, has it not?

Mr. EWING. It has, and it is working, at the end of 7 months, very much more smoothly than we ever anticipated that it would.

Why not tell the American people the truth? We did a job in their interest and in the interest of the people of this country. And, you saved some money by doing it, too, do you know that? Yes; we closed a lot of these regional offices. You had a lot of these boys in there drawing big, fat salaries, and they squealed and they squawked, and they said, "You are going to throw us out of these fat jobs." They did not care anything about efficiency. They cared nothing about whether they were rendering service to the States or not. They were interested in their jobs as people of that kind always are. We went through it and we said, "Listen, we are setting up the Federal Security Agency on an efficient basis." I had the finest kind of help from the top-flight people in the Federal Security Agency to do that job last year. No one man could do it alone. We had wonderful help. But, the fellows on the outside, they always want to raise a political question, and the hangers-on that were getting these big, fat salaries, they did not like it.

Now, we have had it for 7 months. Mr. Ewing, Mr. Kingsley, Mr. Leo Miller, Mr. Stephens, and the people charged with the responsibility of doing that job, have done a magnificent job. And the thing is working. Has social security been destroyed? We cut a million-odd dollars off of Mr. Altmeyer's office. Did you restore it this year? You did not. You cut it even more. Why? Because we demonstrated that the job could be done without all that top-heavy overhead down there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

It seems to me that just common decency and just good neighborliness, under the good-neighbor policy, maybe, should require some of you people to go out and tell the American people the truth about the Eightieth Congress and what they did in connection with this particular program.

I wish I had time to quote all the things that are in this record. Now we are moving in that direction, and I compliment my friend from Rhode Island, who has done a pretty good job. I think he

has seen the light of this picture. Things did not work out as bad as they predicted it would last year, and we are getting some sort of management into this giant, sprawling thing we call the Federal Security Agency.

In this great field of public health that most of you know I have taken some part in for a period of years, I am proud of the work and the contribution that the Federal Government and its Public Health Service has been able to make in this great field of research and control in the matter of disease. I want you to know that the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and I see eye to eye on the necessity for the continuation and the enlargement of this program. There is no politics in it. I was amazed, as he was, and no doubt you were, to read the President's budget and find where he had recommended to this Congress action which, if we allowed it to go through, would have practically destroyed these vital programs involving cancer, heart disease, and mental health.

I am glad to know, and I pay tribute to him again, that the chairman of this subcommittee has the courage, in the face of extreme pressure applied to him as the chairman of a subcommittee not to override the Presidential budget, to stand firm and say, "I am interested in the people of America and in the health and welfare of the people of America. We are not going to allow these programs to deteriorate and be cut back so that they will be destroyed."

You take your hat off to that kind of a fellow. I do. They never take their hats off to me. They throw a lot of bricks at me. But I tell you right now, I take off my hat to that kind of a fellow. I believe in tossing an orchid whenever I find that kind of behavior.

So we have this great program set up and under way. I shall not rehearse again the fine presentation that was made by the chairman of this subcommittee, but I want you to know that I have been privileged to speak over this country and in various parts of the country and to many, many audiences, and I have yet to find the first man or woman who is not willing to pay taxes to support these great programs in the interest of public health. So we are going to move forward.

This represents a compromise. There have to be compromises in all our thinking. I think the chairman and myself would have gone much further with these programs than we finally did as a result of a compromise in the subcommittee. However, as the subcommittee stands, we agreed that we would effect those compromises which are always necessary to get a job done, and we have a bill here that we all support. It is a good bill. It is one that will carry forward the program that the dirty, nasty Eightieth Congress started in many of its aspects.

Again, carrying that program forward in the interests of the welfare of the people of America, we did a thing last year that was one of the most revolutionary things in this whole program that had ever been attempted before.

The scientists of this Nation had looked forward to it for years in the field of research. That was the program of forward financing, by which we provided the funds so that one of these trainees, these young medical men who are in the field of research, could be hired in a research program and be assured that his job would not terminate at the end of any Government fiscal year.

We provided, again, for a construction program in connection with the heart and cancer programs. The President's budget cut that program out entirely, cut out practically all the forward financing. I want to ask the Budget Director or anybody else, what is the use of building all these hospitals around the country under the Hill-Burton implementation, what is the use of building this \$60,000,000 research hospital out here at Bethesda that will be the greatest research institution in the world, what is the use of doing all this research unless you are going to have the doctors and the clinicians and the people to staff these hospitals to give to the people of America the benefit of the research as it takes place?

So I am proud to have had a little part in this program, and I thank the Members of Congress who have unitedly, on both sides of the aisle, unanimously, supported this program. You have been simply wonderful. Last year when the committee came up with a brand new item to take care of public-health activities in Alaska, was there any dispute on the committee? There was not. We overwrote the budget \$1,100,000, and we are overwriting it again \$300,000 on that item, to carry forward that great work in Alaska to try to whip venereal disease and tuberculosis, to protect your son and mine who may be exposed to it as a member of our armed forces. In this field this committee and the Congress have been alert to the needs of the people of the United States. Thank God there has been no division in this field as between Republicans and Democrats. We are going to carry this program forward. We have just begun to scratch the surface. We are simply complementing and supplementing the work that is already going on in the great research centers of America, helping the magnificent men and women who are already in the field unsung and unknown, working day after day at the bench in an effort to find the causes of and a cure for cancer, for heart disease, and all these other ailments that are affecting so many people. Do you not think it is a good work? Are you not proud to be a Member of the Congress that is alert to that situation? Let me close by just saying this: We have many wonderful men and women in this country. That is what makes me believe that we can fight out our troubles and conquer almost any problem, because of the genius of the people of America. Is it not a wonderful thing that men like Maurice Goldblatt, of Chicago, a great businessman, will devote his time, effort, and money as a member of the National Advisory Heart Council trying in every way possible to find a cure for heart disease? Is it not wonderful when a man like Ernst Mahler, one of the distinguished scientists in the field of in-

dustrial chemistry, of the Kimberly-Clark Corp., will devote his time and talents and energies to help humanity serving as a member of this Advisory Council?

I could go on here for an hour and tell of the magnificent work of Dr. Wortis, of New York, in the field of psychiatry and mental health and Dr. Rhoads in the field of cancer, and Dr. White in the field of heart disease. I could tell you of these unselfish, magnificent men working here at Bethesda under the direction of one of the greatest men it has ever been my privilege to know, Dr. Dyer, head of the Institute of Health at Bethesda. I could name any number of these great men who, at great personal sacrifice, as far as money is concerned, are giving of their time, effort, and of their life in the interest of humanity. So that is why I like this bill. That is why I like the men who are on the subcommittee. This bill deals with human interest and human welfare.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a magnificent contribution to public health during the last few years, as has the committee. I, for one, am extremely grateful. My question is whether the placement service for the veterans is working out satisfactorily.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentlewoman talking about the Veterans' Employment Service?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. There was testimony before the committee that it was. Representatives from the various veterans' organizations, appearing before the committee, said that it was. Mr. Faulkner, the Director, said that it was. Apparently the Bureau of the Budget and the President did not think so, because they cut something over a million dollars from this budget this year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I trust the Senate will put it back into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I said this morning and what I had to say in my remarks a year ago, that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], when he was chairman of this committee for 2 years, and myself, were in complete agreement on all items under the Public Health Service. We see eye to eye on every appropriation in the Public Health Service.

I will admit that a year ago I complained quite bitterly about the proposed changes in the Federal Security Agency. I will admit this afternoon that the changes that have been accomplished in the administration of the Federal Security Agency have been all for the good. It has all been beneficial.

I complained in the last 2 years quite bitterly about what the Eightieth Congress was doing to the Department of Labor. I do not see any reason for changing the attitude that I had 2 years ago

when I said publicly, in many speeches in the campaign last year, that the Eightieth Congress was crucifying the Department of Labor. The same type of statement I made on this floor a year ago, and 2 years ago, and I think with some justification.

I do not want to disagree too much with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], because this year above all years we have been getting along much better than we ever anticipated. But when he brings in the record of the Eightieth Congress, if I were ever a candidate as a Republican in a national election I would never want to bring up the name of the Eightieth Congress, because if there was anything that helped elect Mr. Truman as President of the United States, in my humble opinion, it was the record that was established by the Members of the Eightieth Congress.

What did they do to the Department of Labor? In the fiscal year of 1948, 2 years ago, the Eightieth Congress cut the over-all appropriations that were allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for the Department of Labor by about 44 percent, as I recall. Let there be no mistake about that. What happened a year ago? This committee and this House cut the budget estimates of the Department of Labor by 25 percent, which was an additional 20 percent over what they cut them in 1948 fiscal year. Now, when we talked about the Bureau of Labor Statistics, they asked for, roughly, \$5,000,000 2 years ago. What did we do? We cut that Bureau by 40 percent. Our committee did it. Then when we came on the floor to present the bill, as we are today, a motion was made by a Member on the Republican side to cut the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics by another million dollars. Even though we believed at that time, and said so on the floor, that it should not be cut, that is what happened.

What happened a year ago? The Bureau of Labor Statistics asked for over \$5,000,000 and we allowed them \$2,500,000 which is a little more than a 50-percent cut. And not only the cuts that were made by this committee in the last 2 years, but what I was complaining about at that time, and I believe I was right, was that we were taking these various agencies away from the Department of Labor and building up a huge administration in the Federal Security Agency. What happened years ago when we had the old Immigration Service in the Department of Labor? That was taken out. The Children's Bureau was taken out of the Department of Labor. Last year, by action of this Committee on Appropriations, we legislated the United States Employment Service out of the Department of Labor and put it into the Federal Security Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Hoover Commission has made its report, and I am now very thankful that last year when this matter was before the House we based our argu-

ment on the proposition that we should await the report of the Hoover Commission before we took any action as to whether or not the employment services should be taken out of the Department of Labor and put into the Federal Security Agency. If that had been followed we would have avoided a lot of unnecessary work, because the Hoover Commission now is recommending that the employment service be taken from the Federal Security Agency and put back into the Department of Labor where it belongs. Some of us believe that the Conciliation and Mediation Service should be put back into the Department of Labor.

I want to see the Department of Labor a real living department; I want to see it have some authority; I want to see it have some power; and this year for fiscal 1950 for the first time in years, and years, this committee has allowed the full amount that was awarded by the Bureau of the Budget for the Department of Labor.

I will not admit that the figures quoted by the gentleman from Wisconsin are correct; it is not an increase; it is not something that we have made any promise on, that we are going to build this up into a great, huge, governmental agency—I do not want to see it built up unless we can justify it; but there are certain agencies like Employment Security and others that I believe belong in the Department of Labor, and I hope they will eventually be placed there.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened very carefully to what the gentleman has said. He does not challenge the figures which I submitted in my statement. I am just wondering what the gentleman's answer is? The gentleman says we have allowed the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget; as a matter of fact, the gentleman just got through saying how the first session of the Eightieth Congress cut its budget 44 percent, and the second session cut it twenty-odd percent. Has the gentleman's party restored it? Has it overriden the Bureau of the Budget to put those things back? Of course, it has not. You have accepted the figures of the Bureau of the Budget and thus accepted the action of the Eightieth Congress. That is what you have done.

Mr. FOGARTY. We like to proceed with caution in going above the figures of the Bureau of the Budget on any item for which we appropriate, and I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin agrees with me that, in general, none of us want to go above the figures that are given to us by the Bureau of the Budget, because the Bureau has an over-all budget of some forty-odd billions this year. There are a lot of items in the Department of Labor I should like to have increased, but because of the over-all limitation I felt that it was within the policy of making good government in keeping as well as we could within the figures of the Bureau of the Budget; and in only three or four outstanding instances, in public health, did we go above the figures of the Bureau of the Budget.

The fact still remains that the Eightieth Congress did more to tear down and break up the Department of Labor than any other Congress in the history of the Department, since 1913, when the Department of Labor became a Cabinet Department. I read between the lines all the way down the building up of this huge administration under Federal Security which I said a year ago if we let it go on, and on, and on, and built it up, would become such a tremendous agency that we probably could not control it in the future or control the appropriations it was demanding.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I heard the gentleman both in the full committee and in his statement here this morning, and I want to commend the gentleman for the splendid statement he has made.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to confuse the issues here, or anything like that; but, sincerely, if I were running for reelection on the Republican ticket in the next general election, I would not bring up the matter of the Eightieth Congress. It has been so explored, and the record has been brought to every nook and corner of this country that if you want to come back do not run on the record of the Eightieth Congress. If we as Members of the Eighty-first Congress cannot do a hundredfold better job for the common, ordinary people of this country than the Eightieth Congress did in the 2 years the Republicans were in control I do not want to run for reelection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. When are you going to start?

Mr. FOGARTY. We have started. May I say to the gentleman from Maine one of the best starts of any Congress in the history of this country has been made by the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third appropriation bill that has been reported. The schedule called for now by the Committee on Appropriations is to report to the House every appropriation bill by the 1st of May. That is something which has never happened in a previous Congress. To my way of thinking, that is getting a pretty good start on what we intend to do and what we hope to accomplish in this year and the next year. We still have almost 2 years to go to make good and we are going to do our very best to make good in those 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK].

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to thank Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, for his outstanding statement made before our subcommittee and his unselfish cooperation with us in determining the needs of his departments.

I am pleased to report that the death rate from all causes in 1948 is the lowest ever recorded in the history of this country by 9.9 per 1,000 population. There is a marked decrease in the maternal and infant mortality and in such diseases as tuberculosis, pneumonia, and influenza. For example, the death rate from tuberculosis was 194 per 100,000 population in 1900, and in 1948, it was only 31 per 100,000 population.

The increase in births in 1948 was unusually great, being 3,700,000 live babies born during that year. The infant death rate also reached a new low. In 1915, we lost 100 babies out of 1,000 births, before they reached the age of 1 year. In 1948, the rate was only 32 per 1,000 births. This showing may add 17 years to the span of life. A new-born baby may now be expected to reach the age of 67, compared to 50 years in 1900. This is most encouraging, but we are now faced with the problems of the middle life, which is not as good, generally speaking. In 1948, diseases of the heart, kidney, circulatory system, and cancer accounted for 60 percent of all deaths in the United States. In 1900, the same group of diseases accounted for less than 23 percent of all deaths. Since 1900, the death rate for heart diseases and related ailments has increased from 333 per 100,000 population to 466 per 100,000 population. In the same time, cancer has increased from 64 in 1900 to 134 in 1948. This increase is likewise true in mental diseases, 600,000 mental patients now occupying beds in overcrowded hospitals in the United States.

The Public Health Service is one of the oldest Federal agencies. Last July, it celebrated its one-hundred and fiftieth anniversary. Today, it operates 25 marine hospitals and 120 out-patient clinics. It also operates hospitals for narcotic addicts and one leprosy hospital at Carville, La. The marine hospitals and clinics are the first to learn about epidemics and go into action to protect our country against spread of disease. The recent outbreak of yellow fever in Panama was soon under control by the prompt action of the United States Public Health Service. Thousands of doses of yellow-fever vaccine were flown to Panama and thousands of people were immunized against the disease. All quarantine stations and our ports were on the alert to prevent the entry of the infection into this country as well as the South American countries.

A few months ago at Donora, Pa., 20 people lost their lives due to smog. At the request of the Pennsylvania health authorities and other interested people, the Public Health Service stepped in and is making an investigation as to the causes and how to prevent similar occurrences in other communities. Numerous highly trained individuals have been experimenting for the past several

months, endeavoring to ascertain the causes of this calamity.

During the year 1948, the National Institute of Health isolated a virus of the common cold, and is now making an all-out fight against all virus diseases.

Although the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 was passed, which authorizes a new laboratory at Cincinnati, Ohio, for extensive research in the field of water pollution, this laboratory has not yet materialized. This is badly needed, and I hope it can be made available within the near future.

While the death rate from tuberculosis, as formerly stated, has been steadily declining, we still have about 50,000 deaths yearly from this dreaded disease. The States are making more than 1,000,000 X-rays annually under the supervision of the public health, endeavoring to make an early diagnosis of the disease. It is generally known that the secret in treating tuberculosis successfully is an early recognition of the disease, and prompt and scientific treatment established at once.

In the past 10 years, the death rate from syphilis declined 45 percent. It has dropped from 21,000 in 1937 to 13,000 in 1947. There has also been a remarkable decline in congenital syphilis and central nervous system types of diseases which has been especially noticed within the past 10 years.

In the cancer field, Congress has made it possible for the Public Health Service to expand research in the National Cancer Institute and to aid non-Federal institutions in their research. While nothing striking has been brought out in the past few years as to the cause of cancer, it is felt by the authorities that the proper approach is being made and that something is bound to materialize within the near future. We must not get discouraged in this fight. We must wage war against cancer and every effort must be made to determine the causes regardless of the cost and the time it takes to accomplish this.

Concerning the problem of cardiovascular diseases, arthritis, and rheumatism, which affect the heart, we do not know the causes of many pathological conditions of the heart, but we must continue our investigations and experimentations until this problem has been solved.

The question of high blood pressure, for instance, is a question that still must be answered. Just why a young individual must have unusually high blood pressure and another individual, late in life, has a normal blood pressure or even a low type of pressure, is something that we are as yet unable to answer. However, we do know considerable about rheumatic heart disease which is commonly known in the medical profession as endocarditis. This type of heart disease, which should in reality be called infection of the heart, is most always caused by focal infection. In children, infection of the middle ear, diseased tonsils, and adenoids, and in infants pyelitis, are among the common causes of this type of heart infection. In reality, any concealed infection or pus formation within the system can readily cause endocarditis. It is vitally impor-

tant before attempting to eradicate any infection of the body, especially in children, that a few doses of penicillin be given to safeguard against heart complications. This is also true in the treatment of acute inflammatory rheumatism which so frequently causes heart complications. A few years ago, rheumatic heart disease was practically always fatal, or at least the patient was disabled for life. Today, with our modern methods of treatment, a considerable number of these cases recover.

In recent years, there has been a marked increase in diabetes. Thousands of cases have been ascertained through annual physical examinations, examinations made by insurance companies, and the armed services. A simple blood test has recently come into use to determine diabetics and potential diabetics. It is estimated that thousands upon thousands of cases of diabetes now exist that have never been diagnosed.

The dentists of this country are to be congratulated on their recent scientific studies of tooth decay and gum infection. It was only recently that sodium fluoride has become of general use in the prevention of tooth decay in children. Numerous dental treatment units are now in certain sections of the country, endeavoring to instruct teachers and parents, as well as the local dentists in the use of this unusual treatment. It is estimated that 40 percent of tooth infection and cavity formations can be lessened by the use of this remarkable drug. Many communities throughout the country are now making studies and investigations with the idea of using sodium fluoride in their drinking water. Great results may be obtained by such usage. It has also been determined in recent years that the eating of candy is a cause of a large percentage of dental cavities.

In mental diseases, our studies must continue, endeavoring to determine the causes which bring about or promote this ever increasing type of disease. We need hundreds of trained individuals in this field, as well as in the field of heart and cancer diseases to continue the scientific investigations in the effort to relieve the human race of these most dreaded afflictions.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the vast majority of the membership of the House has had numerous communications from constituents and interested parties all over the country, with regard to increasing appropriations for some of these items, especially that of mental diseases. Our committee also received hundreds of communications in this regard. We endeavored to be as liberal as possible and did increase appropriations for cancer, heart diseases, and mental disorders. However, the increase naturally had to be moderate. We will realize the importance of these subjects and millions of dollars could be spent in research which, no doubt, would be money well spent, as far as most of the taxpayers are concerned. But we felt there had to be a limit on the amount of money spent in this regard. The expense of government is terrific, and we sought to make our appropriations justifiable.

I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will realize the responsibility

that was placed on our shoulders and will collaborate with us in this respect.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, in addressing this body for the first time, one must recognize the stupendous task that falls upon every Member of the Congress of the United States. When the partisanship of the campaign is over and five men sit down as we did in this subcommittee representing different political thoughts, coming from districts having little in common—save their Americanism—one recognizes the responsibility that the public has reposed in us.

This subcommittee allowed at no time any partisanship considerations to interfere in its deliberations. We have presented to you, our colleagues, this morning a budget that is not skimpy and yet is not fattened out with unnecessary appropriations.

The Labor Department has received its just due as explained by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Public health is marching on under the guidance of the gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who though not a doctor, has the heart and soul of a physician. And to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] came at all times the guidance of a successful and yet practical and humane businessman.

The Federal Security Agency appropriation consists of a direct total appropriation of one-billion-four-hundred-and-seventy-eight-million-odd dollars, an increase of \$278,000,000 above the 1949 appropriation.

In addition to this sum, there are contract authorizations of \$106,000,000.

Among the departments under the Federal Security Agency is the appropriation for the American Printing House for the Blind which was set at the same amount, namely, \$115,000, as was granted last year.

The employees' compensation fund shows an increase of \$2,188,000. This is occasioned by the fact that there was an increase of approximately 15 percent in claims in 1949 over the previous year. This has been caused by the many injuries sustained during the war years when production, wages, and patriotism kept many employees on the job who thus delayed filing their claims.

The very important protection which is afforded to the food-consuming public is handled by our Food and Drug Administration. This agency is charged by law with the enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the purpose of which is to protect the public from harmful, impure, or falsely labeled food and drugs. It is interesting to note that every day an average of 10 tons of rat or insect defiled foods are seized, the violators prosecuted, and the public is saved from illness and death. The committee saw fit to grant this department the sum of \$5,900,000 and for this amount the American public is certainly getting real value.

The Bureau of Vocational Education receives the exact appropriation that it

received last year, \$19,842,000, being the amount allotted by the Bureau of the Budget, plus certain allocations for Hawaii and Puerto Rico. With these allocations, the Office of Vocational Education has been allotted roughly \$24,000,000.

Vocational rehabilitation is a program that appeals to everyone, first from a humane and even from a business viewpoint. The program is jointly financed by the States and the Federal Government; the States provide the services to the individual and the States defray half the costs of medical examinations, and surgical treatments. The Federal Government pays the other half of these costs as well as the costs of administration.

We are happy to advise this body that through this agency over 65 thousand people were rehabilitated this year and approximately seventy-four thousand should be rehabilitated next year. These people now take their place in society, contribute to our tax rolls, and if there is one agency that certainly returns more than it takes, it is this vocational rehabilitation program.

The problem of grants to States for unemployment compensation presented a difficult and somewhat vexatious problem. In view of the sudden and substantial increase in work load in the various States in paying unemployment compensation during the last two or three months, your committee felt it necessary to give extended consideration to the amount of funds needed by the States next year. A deficiency of \$10,000,000 was approved by the House several days ago to give the States some additional funds to handle the recent rise in work load and with that amount, if ultimately granted, they will be able to operate during the balance of the current fiscal year to June 30, making it in all in the neighborhood of a \$150,000,000 annual operation. The committee was convinced that the budget of \$135,000,000 was insufficient for next year but it is next to impossible to forecast precisely the amount of funds needed. The record of past appropriations was that the States have had to run deficits and come in for supplemental appropriations almost every year. Some of the State costs are controllable; others are uncontrollable. In an effort to make reasonable provision for State operations, the bill provides for \$150,000,000 during the first three-fourths of the fiscal year. This should permit the States to be able to operate effectively in handling payments of unemployment compensation promptly while at the same time permitting them to maintain a vigorous and effective employment service which certainly should be maintained at a time when people are unemployed and asking for compensation payments.

The language of the bill also provides for a contingency reserve of \$7,500,000. The States and the Federal bureau have advocated some such procedure as this for several years and it is designed to provide some reasonable means for meeting emergencies when the Congress is not in session, or sudden increases in unemployment work loads which no one can foresee.

I appreciate that there are two schools of thought on the question of employment. Our committee considered all this and are united in the hope that unemployment will decrease but we are not prophets and it is our studied opinion that this appropriation will be sufficient for at least a period of 9 months and we believe for longer.

Because of the statutory obligation for public assistance which is on a State grant-matching basis, the Federal Government is obligated to appropriate \$1,058,000,000 and this amount has been included in the bill. This is an increase of \$261,000,000 over last year's budget. The Federal matching provisions were increased as of last October.

Another item that our committee has been diligent in observing is the question of administrative costs. They have been carefully pared wherever possible; for instance the Federal Security Administrator has asked for an increase of \$223,000 for additional assistants. This item has been deleted entirely from the bill.

Mindful of the statutory obligations and the forward march in the field of health and the development of our Federal security program and justice for the Labor Department, we respectfully submit this budget for the consideration of the House.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very fine and cordial relations that this committee has enjoyed I hesitate to inject politics into the discussion. But inasmuch as the chairman of the subcommittee has seen fit to do so I say here again that I am partly in agreement and partly in disagreement with him. Rather than referring to "the record of the Eightieth Congress" I would qualify that as I have qualified some of his other statements and say, "The unknown record of the Eightieth Congress," because our greatest campaign weakness was in not making the record of the Eightieth Congress known to the American people. For had the American voters known the entire record, they would have endorsed it.

Along with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], I am serving my apprenticeship on this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. When this assignment was given me, I did not know what the future held for me in that activity. I had known the gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK, before having served with him on the Veterans' Legislative Committee. Judge McGRATH, a new member, I did not know. I had not had much contact with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], though I knew the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. But all of my misgivings were ill-founded and it has been a very, very pleasant relation. The hearings went forward with great dispatch. Sometimes I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK], and I felt that we were taking some of these things pretty much on faith and sometimes on faith twice removed, because the gentle-

man from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] had gone into many of these matters with the various witnesses in very great detail over the past 2 years. We did not know them so well, but having faith in the chairman and the former chairman, and having faith in their faith in some of these witnesses, we took some of their statements just that way.

There was not complete unanimity. I thought some of the items could have been scaled down some more. I thought very few of them needed more than the budget allowed. We heard the presentations. All of our differences were in the committee room. There they were settled and we are unanimous in our position on this bill today.

The chairman remarked that we were called upon to consider some ILO funds. Our discussion of that and the hearings disclosed that as far as we saw the legislative authority which was cited to us did not relate to appropriations to this particular phase of the matter at all but rather to the Department of State. While we are mentioning ILO, I think some of you gentlemen may find some very interesting reading if you get the reports of the International Labor Organization, particularly the convention adopted by that organization in Philadelphia in 1945. You may find there some of the roots or some of the ideas for some of the far-reaching programs that have been suggested to the Eighty-first Congress in the last few weeks.

On the matter of railroad retirement, as has been suggested, Congress is dealing with trust funds. This appropriation does not come out of the general treasury as we think of appropriations, but nevertheless this committee has a duty to perform. We are obliged to see that these trust funds are properly handled and that they are handled with as great economy and efficiency as is humanly possible to conserve all of the funds available in that trust, so that the employees of the railroads may have full benefit thereof.

Mention has been made of the appropriation this year for old age assistance, and dependent and crippled children. That is a thousand and fifty-eight million dollars. Yes, \$1,058,000,000. That is a great sum. To show you how these programs grow—well, it sounds like the Old Gold program that we hear on Sunday night—they grow and grow and grow. The first appropriation for old age assistance in 1938 was \$214,000,000. Today it is \$1,058,000,000; it tripled in the last few years, so they tell us. It makes us wonder where it is going in the next few years. We should see in our minds, as we think of these things, the sign on the railroad crossing, "Stop, look and listen." Where are all of these funds coming from? Where are they going? If you read some of the tables that were placed in these hearings at my request you will see that some of these programs look like the old game of put and take. Some States put in millions and millions of dollars and take little out; other States put in very little and take out enormous sums. It may be interesting if the Members study this juggling of funds and see how

the redistribution of wealth has taken place in the activities of this Government.

In the unemployment program we found some interesting information. The Congress and the public should be informed as to the charges made by some of the inadequate way in which it is claimed that the States have been carrying on their unemployment service; that they are not doing a proper job of scanning all these applications for unemployment payments. Well, there is not much mystery about it. The States can only do so much with the money that is recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget and allotted to them by appropriations. We find that from these taxes on employers, the Federal Treasury has received \$1,313,580,000. That money has gone into the Federal Treasury. How much has gone out to the States for administration and in payment of benefits to employees, in these various State offices in that period of time? Five hundred and forty-eight million dollars, which means that there has been a net profit to the Treasury of the United States of \$800,000,000. If that \$800,000,000 paid in as a special fund by the employers of this Nation had been distributed to the States of this Nation, I dare say there would have been a much better job done, especially in the screening of many of these claims, and many, many millions of dollars might well have been saved.

According to the chairman [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] there has been a great deal of improvement in efficiency in the Federal Security Agency in its application of the programs. From the admissions made to us, there can be still greater improvement. Mr. Ewing and Mr. Kingsley both admitted that there was a great deal of overlapping of programs. When we tried to find out where the overlapping is, they said, "Well we do not know where it is, but we know it is there." The heads of these various offices, along with the various employees who handle the financial activities and the budget matters, might very well look into some of these overlapping programs and eliminate those that now overlap. We will then have a still more efficient department there than we now have.

Two things have not been mentioned, but I think this House should give some detailed thought to them. One is Howard University. Starting on page 688 of the hearings, you will find the full and complete hearings on this great school. Starting on that page, you will find where Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, the president of this university, told the entire story of the fine work they are doing, of the type of graduate they are turning out, the faculty they have, the difficulties they have encountered. But they are doing a marvelous job, and they are working on a great asset of this country, namely, young people of America. To carry on this program, constantly increasing appropriations have been made. The young colored people going out of there as graduates are doing a marvelous job not only in teaching but in medicine, dentistry, engineering, and all the other courses that are made available. Dr. Johnson is

to be commended on the fine leadership he has given to the school and its pupils over a period of years, and the fine example he makes for them. He told us that he had come there to take a temporary job when he took that assignment, but that temporary job now has lasted over 20 years, according to my recollection. He can well be proud of the work he has done.

Many people seem to have the idea that Howard University is completely financed by the Federal Government. That is not true. The school is not financed completely by Federal funds at all. You will find that the students attending that school pay over \$1,000,000 for their tuition just as in other schools. It is true there is a very considerable amount appropriated to finance the school, and properly so, I think, in view of all the circumstances, the past history and the very fine work they are doing. The money spent there will eventually repay this Nation not only in the services of those graduates but in the fine caliber of citizenship that will be there developed.

The other item that should be mentioned here, is Freedmen's Hospital, the cost of which runs more than the cost of a normal hospital because it is an adjunct of Howard University. The young colored students of medicine are taking much of their training and some of their internship there. With the added use of this hospital for education there is, of course, a greater cost of operation than there might be in some other hospital.

Before my time expires there is one question that I feel should be answered. That is one about the reduction of \$11,000,000 in the appropriations for general health. This program is in addition to the special ones relating to cancer, heart, tuberculosis, venereal disease, and all that. We looked over that program, which called for an increase of more than 100 percent over last year's budget. They told us that the \$11,000,000 they had last year took this general health service to communities with a total population of 90,000,000 people. They wanted to more than double it, and thus increase the scope of activity to only another 10,000,000 people. We thought that they just were not making a showing of sufficient utility of the dollars to justify this increase in appropriation; therefore, it was denied. Even though the increase was denied, their present activities will not be curtailed.

In closing, I, too, want to commend the chairman and other members of the committee on the very fine way in which this bill has been handled. Although nearly all of my suggestions for decreases were overruled, it was done with such a charming smile and courtesy that even though I did not get the proposals over, the wound was not deep.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

IS IT A FAIR DEAL TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST INDEPENDENT UNIONS IN WRITING OUR LABOR LAWS?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, it has always been my contention that whenever Congress considers labor legislation care must be taken to see that all work-

ing men and women are treated fairly and squarely, not just the few millions who happen to be members of the CIO or the AFL.

It is commonly overlooked in Congress and in public discussions and in the newspapers that there are hundreds of independent unions with millions of members in these United States. They have a perfect right to be considered in all our discussions and considerations. It also frequently is overlooked that there are millions of laboring men and women who do not belong to any union. They, too, of course, should have a place in our minds when we think of legislation for all the people of our Nation.

Personally, my study of independent unions has proved to me that these can be the most effective for the individual worker and yet not be subjected to all the ills and weaknesses and abuses to which the big unions sometimes have been subjected. The members of the independent unions are more aware of their role in union affairs; they are more anxious to preserve their unions and to increase production. They have better leaders, all things considered, than do the members of the huge, mass unions which could prove so dangerous if infiltrated by the Communists and misled by men who want to make over America.

Mr. Chairman, I am referring to these independent unions at this time because of a recent visit with Floyd Huber and Maurice Porter, representatives of the independent union of the Sutherland Paper Co., at Kalamazoo, Mich. They are constituents of mine and I know them to be patriotic, sincere, honest, hard-working Americans. This also is true of most of their members, and of the vast majority of the workmen in my district, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Mr. Huber and Mr. Porter understand that there is to be a repeal of the labor law we passed 2 years ago and that another labor law is to be enacted. I do not know whether this is to be the case or not, as yet, but I hear it myself. Personally, I am strongly in favor of the so-called Taft-Hartley bill. I voted for it before and I will vote for it again, although it, like all legislation, has some points in it that could be revised without too great difficulty.

The two independent union representatives brought me a resolution which their union had passed at a recent meeting. With the permission of my colleagues, I should like to read this resolution:

Whereas there have been instances of discrimination against segments of American labor; and

Whereas new legislation is presently being formulated: It is hereby

Resolved, That the Confederated Unions of America at this time present to the Congressmen of each individual State, these four points to be made a part of the new labor law:

1. In deciding all cases under the National Labor Relations Act of 1949, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply irrespective of whether or not the labor organization affected is affiliated with the labor organizations national or international in scope.

2. Equal representation in the Department of Labor.

3. Upon request of the parties in dispute, the Secretary of Labor shall furnish arbitrators—all cost of which is to be borne by the National Government;

4. In the appointment of Labor-Management Advisory Committees for respective industries, equal representation must be granted all unions whether or not the union is national or international in scope.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there are many men in the Congress who are opposed to discrimination. At this time, a great deal of talk for and against discrimination is being heard on every side.

I am personally opposed to discrimination. Let me urge my colleagues to stand beside me. The particular discrimination to which I object—although there are many others, of course—concerns these independent unions. Of all the minorities in America, I sometimes think they are more discriminated against than any other.

For years, the present political administration has ignored the leaders of these independent unions. No independent union representative ever has been chosen to become an Assistant Secretary of Labor. There is a vacancy now in the Department of Labor for a union man of high caliber. But is any consideration being given to the idea of putting an independent union leader in that post? Not that I have heard of. I urge the President and his coworkers to consider this idea. While the suggestion comes from a Republican, it is still a good suggestion and I hope that some one among "the powers that be" will act upon it.

Likewise, for many years, under the old Wagner Act and the National Labor Relations Board as constituted in the hey-day of the New Deal, independent unions could expect no mercy if they happened to run afoul either the AFL or the CIO. The NLRB in those days invariably discriminated against the independents and in favor of the major unions. Only during the past 2 years has the NLRB made any attempt to deal fairly and squarely with the independent unions.

Yet, even under the Taft-Hartley law, there have been some discriminations against the independent unions, although not purposely so, of course. A provision in the law makes it mandatory for any union in a dispute to pay a part of the cost of the mediation. The costs in such cases, to the big unions, were inconsequential. But to the small, independent unions, these costs are exorbitant. It is manifestly unfair to ask the small, independent unions to bear the same share of this cost that the large, well-financed unions, with millions of members, are asked to pay.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am against discrimination, and I know that you and other Congressmen join with me in the determination to do everything possible to stop the discrimination against small, independent unions. They are composed of the hard-working, thoughtful, patriotic, law-abiding citizens America needs in this crucial period. We should encourage them, not discourage them.

The Government, in all its resources and majesty, could afford to pay the relatively small sums for conciliation and

arbitration needed in various union disputes. The members of small, independent unions should not be penalized by having to pay these costs.

Mr. Chairman, President Truman has told the people of the country that his administration is to be the Fair Deal administration. If this is true, the discrimination against independent unions must cease. Members of these independent unions should be given equal consideration under our labor laws with members of the AFL and CIO.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve and retired personnel service law of 1940, as amended, and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law 759, approved June 24, 1948), and under the act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1472), of persons who have performed service in the merchant marine, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$270,000.

Mr. FOGARTY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be subject to points of order and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

Are there any amendments to be offered?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAVALCANTE: Page 32, line 18, after the word "year", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That any State receiving a grant for such assistance or aid shall not require as a condition precedent from any recipient of such assistance or aid a promise, bond, or lien whereby such recipient or his or her estate shall be held to make repayment or restitution in the amount or part of any assistance or aid received by such recipient."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I add that it also imposes additional duties on the Department in question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is definitely in order. I merely wish to call to the attention of the Chair the decision by the House not many days ago when the deficiency appropriation bill was before us, when an amendment similar to this was

offered to that bill and the ruling of the Chair was that the amendment was proper and in order.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would entail additional duties upon the agency involved. Therefore, it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House, without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 29, lines 8 to 17, strike out the first proviso and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That, to the extent that the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from change in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the original State's grant was based, this appropriation may be apportioned and obligated at an annual rate not in excess of \$150,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, in one to include an address and in the other to include a letter written to the President of the United States.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, in one to include a magazine article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a certain article.

Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. BIEMILLER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement he made before the Rules Committee.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an open letter by Generoso Pope.

Mr. FORD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution from the city of Grand Rapids.

RADAR AIR WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 129 and asked for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] 30 minutes; and pending that, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill (H. R. 2546) a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes.

This is a highly technical matter. It is not such a matter that one who has had as little opportunity as I have had to study it, could intelligently discuss or explain. The learned gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] who

is a member of the Armed Services Committee, is fully familiar with the purposes and necessity for this legislation. I shall, therefore, defer to him and not take the time of the House myself. I am sure that when the House goes into the Committee of the Whole that he will give the House the necessary information to justify this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, since I have no request for time on this side, I shall move the previous question on the resolution unless the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] desires to speak or has request for time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on the Republican side.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2546, with Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan for 30 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the Committee for consideration, H. R. 2546, is of the most urgent character; it is necessary for the maintenance of our national security. The bill provides for the erection of public works, including buildings, facilities, utilities, and roads in both the continental United States and in Alaska, which may be necessary to provide for the establishment of an adequate air warning and control system. Let me make doubly clear what I just said by emphasizing again that the authorization in this legislation is merely a public-works authorization. At the same time, however, the bill has much broader and more far-reaching implications. The construction of the public works which it will authorize is a necessary prerequisite to the setting up of an aircraft warning and control system which will alert our people and our defensive forces in sufficient time to permit the employment of all effective means of defense available to us against attacking enemy aircraft seeking to destroy our vital centers of production and population. The public works themselves will not provide us with an operational system; in addition

there must be radar equipment, communications equipment, and an organization, in being, manned by highly trained technical personnel. But all of these essential elements must await the construction of the necessary public works.

An aircraft warning and control system is vitally needed for the protection of the United States. But let me make clear at the outset that such a system in and of itself alone by no means guarantees us security against injury from enemy air attack. To understand why this is so we must first know exactly what an aircraft warning and control system is and, secondly, what it is capable of doing and what it cannot do.

The primary purpose of such a system is to detect approaching enemy aircraft in sufficient time before they arrive at vital targets to permit friendly interceptor fighters to be directed against the enemy planes so that they may destroy them before they have accomplished their mission.

That is not the only purpose of such a system but it is by far its most important function. Other purposes are to alert other active defensive forces such as antiaircraft batteries and, also, to give air-raid warnings in order that every available means of passive defense as well may be employed.

But turning back again to what I said was the most important function, namely, the direction of interceptor fighters, let me explain why this is true.

As we all know, it is an axiom of military operations that the best defense is a good offense. This principle applies with full force in the case of air defense against attacking enemy aircraft. If we merely sound our air-raid warnings when enemy planes approach, it will be possible indeed for our population to seek cover in air-raid shelters and to take other measures of a passive category. But none of these passive defensive measures will stop the enemy bombers from coming over the targets and dropping their bomb loads. Much more can be accomplished if we mount an actual offensive against the enemy planes. That is, if we attack them with every means at our disposal. To a limited extent we can do this with antiaircraft, but this means again that we are seriously restricted because the enemy planes cannot be attacked until they actually fly within range of the antiaircraft batteries. We could, of course, deploy antiaircraft guns in such a way that no possible area of the sky was not covered, but the cost of any such fantastic proposal would be out of this world.

It is easy to see, therefore, why fighter aircraft afford the best available means of defense over large areas such as that of the United States. Because of their tactical mobility fighters can move around over large areas to any point where attacking hostile aircraft may appear. We can thus obtain a far greater degree of protection and can intercept a good many of the attacking aircraft long before they reach their targets, and can do so far more economically than if we made the entire countryside bristle with antiaircraft guns.

Now there are several technical points about an aircraft warning and control system which ought to be made very clear. When I say that they are technical, I do not mean that they are beyond the comprehension of a layman; on the contrary, an understanding of these features is essential to an understanding of the purposes of and the need for this legislation.

First of all, an aircraft warning and control system performs considerably more than the mere function of detection and early warning of approaching aircraft as they cross our borders. A flight of enemy planes entering the United States at a given point might be destined for any one of a great number and variety of vital strategic targets located one, two, or three or more hours of flight time away from the point of entry. If we knew that the planes had entered the United States, we could, of course, alert the entire country with consequent stoppage of production while the whole population scurried for air raid shelters. The absurdity of such a procedure is obvious. It is also clear that if we knew merely that at a given moment the planes had crossed our border and thereafter had no knowledge of their subsequent path, we would have no way of telling our fighters where to intercept them. It would do no good to send our interceptor planes to the point where the enemy had crossed the border because by the time they arrived there the enemy will have long since passed on.

Faced with these problems, therefore, it is plain that we must provide some method of continually tracking enemy aircraft once they have been detected so that we will know at any moment thereafter exactly where they are and what changes of direction they may take. Only by continually tracking the enemy position can we lead our friendly fighters to the kill.

It is this element of fighter direction which is the most important single function of an aircraft warning and control system. It is this which gives the system the name "control." What the system accomplishes is first, to detect and constantly track approaching enemy aircraft and, secondly, to issue orders to friendly interceptors to take off and attack the enemy. While they are doing so they are guided by control centers on the ground to the point of interception. Should the enemy change his course radically between the time the friendly fighters take off and the time they catch him, the control centers on the ground will be able to detect this change of course by means of the continual tracking process, and will be able to alter the course of our fighters accordingly.

Now I am sure that most of you gentlemen are familiar with the method in which radar is employed as the means for detecting and tracking the enemy planes and for directing our own planes against them. At the cost of repeating some information with which I am sure many of you are thoroughly familiar, it might be advisable nevertheless to go over some of the characteristics of radar rather briefly.

As you know, radar was developed shortly before World War II and was

shrouded in secrecy during that conflict, so much so that for a long time even the name "radar" itself was taboo. We all know today, however, that it was one of the most important developments contributing to our successful operations in World War II, and it is very important that we should also fully realize in considering the pending legislation that it was radar which won the Battle of Britain. Radar, employed in much the same manner that we propose to employ it under this bill, was the key to the aircraft warning and control system established by the British. It was by means of radar that the approach of Hitler's planes was detected and by means of radar that the RAF defenders were guided to an interception.

Radar functions on a very simple principle despite the fact that complicated electronic equipment is required to make use of this principle. An ultra high-frequency transmitter sends out a radio wave of very high frequency. This wave travels through space until it strikes a target such as an approaching enemy plane, an enemy surface ship, or a distant mountain and a portion of the wave is then reflected back to the transmitting station where it is picked up by a receiver. Both the transmitter and the receiver, of course, are all part of the radar set. In addition, the set contains an electronic device capable of measuring the lapse of time between the instant when the radar impulse or wave was sent out and the instant when it returned. Since the speed at which the wave travels through space is known, the radar set computes the distance at which the target which reflected back a part of the wave is located. Also, because it is possible to control the direction in which the wave is beamed in the first instance, the radar set can tell us not only how far the target is but in what direction it lies. These two elements, direction and distance, enable us to locate the target's exact position on the map with reference to the known position of the radar set.

Now you will remember that I said a moment ago that a portion of the wave would be reflected back. Other portions of the same wave will travel out farther to other targets and the radar set will then show these to lie at a greater distance and in perhaps a slightly different direction. The point I want to bring out is one with which most of us are thoroughly familiar, namely, that our present-day radars as developed during World War II permit us to see a picture of the entire area within a distance of many miles in all directions from the radar set. The radar actually gives us a picture very much like a map on which we can see mountains, airplanes, high buildings and chimneys and, if at sea, ships, aircraft, land, and so forth. In other words, when used in an aircraft warning and control system, it will give us a continual picture of the enemy planes moving across the screen and it will also show us our own fighter planes and permit us to see at any instant whether they are headed on the proper course for an interception.

I said a few moments ago that radar was responsible for winning the Battle of Britain. This brings me to one of the

most important points which we must constantly bear in mind in our consideration of the present legislation. An aircraft warning and control system will not under any circumstances guarantee us absolute security. There is no means known to science or the military today whereby we can throw an impenetrable ring or barrier around the United States which will protect us against all injury from enemy air attack. We cannot hope to keep out completely all enemy bombers who may seek to destroy vital centers. The best we can do is to destroy some of them and to attempt insofar as we can to disorganize their mission so completely that those we cannot shoot down will unload their bombs over some mountain-side perhaps, instead of over a railroad yard. But even then many of the enemy's planes may still get through to points where vital damage can be done.

Radar and the aircraft warning and control system in which it was employed in the Battle of Britain did not win World War II, nor did it prevent tremendous destruction and loss of life in London, Coventry, and other cities. Neither did it destroy the German Luftwaffe. But granting all this to be true, let us make no mistake about its effectiveness. Had it not been for radar and for the British aircraft control and interception system by which Spitfires were unleashed against the oncoming Luftwaffe, it is virtually certain that the Battle of Britain would have been lost. And there can be no doubt that the ensuing destruction of cities and loss of life would have been of untold proportions so grave that the actual damage done in World War II would look negligible by comparison. Had Britain not possessed this system, she could have offered no effective defense against the German attacks.

It is because no other means exist for effectively utilizing our defensive capabilities that we so urgently need an aircraft warning and control system in this country. We must have the means by which we too can detect, track, and effectively intercept enemy aircraft threatening our homeland. Such a system is indispensable to the economical and effective use of our defensive weapons such as fighter aircraft and antiaircraft artillery. Without such a system it would be theoretically possible to deploy fighters so thickly in the air space over the United States that they could not fail to intercept any attack, but it is equally clear that the economy of this country would collapse before we were able to build the number of planes which would then be required. An aircraft warning and control system permits us to make the most effective and economical use of the planes and the guns which we have. It tells us that the enemy planes are here—and not over there somewhere; it thus enables us to direct our fighters here—instead of having them patrol aimlessly somewhere else. It also tells us that we must take passive defense measures and seek security in air-raid shelters here—and that it will not be necessary to do so in other places. Thus production may continue uninterrupted everywhere else although it may be necessary to suspend it temporarily here while the attack is in progress.

As the aircraft warning system used in the Battle of Britain did not suffice to destroy the Luftwaffe, nor to prevent many of its planes from bombing London, neither can we reasonably expect complete security from the system which will be provided under this bill. But what the Battle of Britain did accomplish, and what we can reasonably expect from our own aircraft warning and control system under comparable circumstances, was to provide the means whereby the interceptor fighters of the RAF were able to exact such a high toll of German bombers that Hitler was suddenly brought to the realization that the attacks were unprofitable in terms of the balance between the damage inflicted on Britain and the losses which he was suffering. This consideration alone forced Hitler to the conclusion that the German economy could not much longer stand the drain resulting from the high attrition rate imposed upon his bombers.

In like manner we hope to establish in the United States a warning and control system which will permit us to use our own interceptor planes so effectively that we can impose a prohibitive attrition rate upon enemy bombers seeking to destroy our vital centers. We cannot escape unscathed without a scratch, nor can we hope to avoid being hurt—perhaps badly in some places. But if we can provide the means whereby our fighters can hurt the hostile bombers badly enough to make the enemy call the whole thing off, the aircraft warning system will have fully justified the expenditure of every penny invested in it.

When we consider how much more effectively we will be able to use our defensive fighter aircraft with an aircraft warning and control system, it becomes very clear that we may actually be able to reduce the over-all cost of air defense because of the simple fact that a lesser number of fighters can be used more effectively. I do not mean to imply by this that we can afford any reduction in the number of fighters presently planned, even with such a system in being. The point is that we would need a great many more to adequately protect the United States if we do not provide an aircraft warning and control system.

An aircraft warning and control system consists essentially of radar stations, control centers, and communications facilities. An individual radar station will pick up enemy planes on its radar screen, and after identifying them as hostile aircraft, will communicate information as to their location to a control center. The control center will have operational control over defensive fighter aircraft and antiaircraft weapons and will immediately alert all defensive forces under its command which can be brought to bear upon the enemy. It will issue orders to fighters to take off and will guide them to a point of interception.

From what I have said to you so far, I believe it will be quite obvious that an aircraft warning and control system must be set up in such a manner as to provide a sufficient interval of time between initial detection and interception to permit all the necessary steps in the process to be taken before the enemy planes reach vital targets. In other

words, the radar stations which detect the planes must be so located geographically in relation to vital strategic targets that the process of identification as enemy aircraft, transmission of information to a control center, orders to fighters, take-off of fighters, climb to enemy altitude and actual interception—so that all of these steps in the process can be accomplished before the enemy bombers arrive at their assigned targets.

Radar unfortunately has certain technical limitations. The radio waves or beams which it utilizes cannot be directed below the horizon. In other words, radar cannot "see" around the horizon and hence can detect only those targets which are above the line of sight to the horizon. It is this feature which made it possible for low-flying planes during World War II to escape detection by radar as they approached their targets. Just as a high mountain can be seen over the horizon, so also can a plane flying at higher altitudes. For all practical purposes, therefore, the range of radar is limited to about 150 miles, assuming that the attacking planes fly at altitudes which are tactically feasible. However, we can obtain greater range by deploying an additional radar station beyond the first. This would give us what was recently referred to in the newspapers as a two-notch program, whereas one station would represent what we might call a one-notch program. You may ask why, if we use two notches, we could not dispense with the original notch on the inside. We would still require that in order to enable us to continually track the enemy after he had passed inside the range of the outer radar station. Otherwise, without the inner station we would merely obtain early warning from the outer screen, but we would not know what the enemy's position was subsequently and hence we would be unable to continually track him until our fighters were able to complete the interception.

Because the basic active defense weapon for any large area is the fighter airplane, the first and most important consideration in organizing an aircraft warning and control system is to meet the requirements for fighter defense.

Fighters may be moved quickly to meet changing situations, but an aircraft-warning system is relatively fixed and immobile. We must, therefore, provide an aircraft-warning service in those areas in which it appears likely that we may be required to deploy fighters. The establishment of an aircraft-warning system is, in effect, an organization of the ground to provide a capability for utilizing fighters effectively. Actual fighter deployment will depend upon the force available and the tactical situation.

Aircraft warning requirements for fighter defense are based largely on the time and space relationship between friendly fighter performance, enemy aircraft performance, radar performance, geographic deployment of fighter airfields, geographic deployment of radar stations, and geographic location of the boundary of the area being defended.

Defensive fighter aircraft on ground-alert status at an airfield will be ready to take off on orders from a control center. However, because of the time ele-

ment involved in the performance of all the necessary steps which must take place between the time of initial detection of enemy aircraft and the time of completion of interception, the enemy aircraft will have advanced a considerable distance during this interval. Hence an area lying between the point where they were originally detected and the point of interception by friendly fighters cannot be defended by the fighters; an area lying behind the point of interception by the fighters may, on the other hand, be considered to be defended.

From this it is very clear that if we can extend our early warning frontiers farther out, so to speak, we should be able to discover the enemy earlier, thus permitting fighters to intercept him earlier, and thereby extending the cover of fighter protection over a larger territory.

Where it is necessary to protect a vital target lying out in an area which is not defended, that is exactly what we will do. We will deploy an additional radar station farther out, thereby extending the cover of fighter protection to the target in question. In this manner, simply by deploying a radar station outward, we can obtain the same additional degree of protection which could otherwise be achieved only by the construction of an additional fighter airfield at a considerably greater expense.

The deployment of radar stations and control centers under the proposed program is designed to achieve full utilization of available fighter airfields.

The control centers, which will exercise tactical control over defensive fighter aircraft, will be provided, of course, with their incoming lines of communication from outlying radar stations which will furnish information of approaching hostile aircraft. But, in addition, they will also have lines of communication to civil and military airfields, both Air Force and Navy, for the operational control of fighters; to local antiaircraft artillery defenses; and to CAA traffic centers for movement liaison and control. Finally, there will be lines to local military commands for air-raid warnings and, also, off-shore radio liaison for coordination with naval ships and forces at sea. The control center will be the point from which all air-defense operations are controlled and directed for a given area. It is to be the command post of the air-defense area in which it is located. I will now proceed to a description of these areas.

The entire United States must be organized into air-defense areas to enable us to conduct an effective air defense. As I said a few moments ago, the system which it is proposed to establish is essentially an organization of the ground to provide a capability for utilizing our defensive fighter aircraft effectively. Accordingly, the entire United States will be divided into eight air-defense areas for peacetime and initial operations in war.

Upon mobilization of the Air National Guard, the eight original areas will be subdivided to make a total of 20 air-defense areas, covering the entire United States. Each of these areas will be under the command of an area air-defense

commander whose command post will be a control center. Of the 12 control centers to be brought into operation and manned by the Air National Guard a few days after mobilization, 10 are to be used as peacetime training stations at the home of the unit. The other two centers will have to be manned by National Guard units from other areas. These two must be constructed in advance and ready to receive the National Guard units. These two, plus the eight initial centers, make up the total of 10 centers in our current construction program.

The closest possible coordination exists between the Air Force and the Army and Navy in connection with this program, and I might say that the committee has been impressed by the cooperation evidenced by the three services and by the complete absence of the slightest indication of the existence of any inter-service problems or controversies in this field. The only difficulties which exist today are those which stem from purely technical problems rather than from questions of responsibility.

Under the program planned, the commander of the eastern and western air defenses, respectively, will be charged with coordination with eastern and western sea frontiers and with the appropriate United States Army commanders in matters of mutual defense.

This program will provide the United States with the minimum acceptable degree of protection from a military point of view, but, at the same time, it is one which is economically feasible. It will furnish us with a modest degree of protection at a very reasonable cost; without this system we would have no protection whatsoever against attack by enemy aircraft.

It will require a considerable length of time to install and perfect this system and to make it operational. This element of lead time is of vital importance in our consideration of the present legislation. If the protection sought by this bill is to become a reality within a reasonable time in the future, we must act at once to get this program under way. Prompt and early action is essential if the United States is to have an adequate system of air defense within a reasonable time in the future. In this connection, let me point out that the achievement of an operational system in being will be necessary before we can expect protection from an aircraft warning and control system. The mere construction of buildings and installation of equipment is not sufficient. The system must be a going concern—an organization of large numbers of technical and operating personnel who have had extensive training and experience over a long period of time. I can think of no more appropriate illustration of the importance of this factor than the recent press reports regarding the failure of Navy radar operators to detect the approaching aircraft which recently dropped a simulated A bomb over a task force in the current fleet maneuvers. It is inconceivable that such penetration could have been accomplished without detection in actual operations during World War II when all

personnel and units were in a high state of training and readiness.

The proposed program is of high priority, particularly in view of the time factor mentioned which will be required not only to accomplish the prompt installation of radar equipment, but also to achieve the required level of training and operational experience necessary to make the system fully operational. Until the system is in being and operationally effective, the Air Force cannot hope to discharge its primary responsibility for the air defense of the United States. Neither can the forces of the Army and the Navy, which those Departments will be required to furnish in defense of the United States against air attack, be utilized with maximum effectiveness unless employed in conjunction with a land-based air-defense system. The establishment of the system, however, will facilitate the development of tactics and techniques for joint employment of all available forces for air defense.

Because of the vital importance of this program as a defensive measure, the Air Force deemed it appropriate to request specific authority for the construction herein authorized, apart from the usual public-works program.

A construction program amounting to \$85,500,000 will be authorized pursuant to the authority contained in this bill. This sum includes only the cost of construction of buildings, facilities, utilities, and other public works. It does not include the acquisition cost of real estate nor the cost of radar and communications equipment.

The total over-all cost of the air-warning and control system, including those costs which are not covered by the present legislation, will amount to approximately \$161,000,000, exclusive of personnel costs. This sum includes an item of \$42,250,000, representing the value of radar and communications equipment now on hand, which has already been bought and paid for. It also includes \$7,000,000 for the cost of conversion and equipment of four radar picket vessels to be provided by the Navy under the program. These four vessels will be used to provide radar coverage over sea approaches in localities where the proximity of vital targets to the coast line precludes the deployment of land-based radar installations sufficiently far out to permit early warning and interception of enemy planes. Funds for these vessels were requested by the Navy but were deleted from current budget estimates prior to submission to the Congress. It is understood that the Navy already has a number of vessels of this character; hence these vessels can be provided by the Navy, even though funds are not included in the budget. In furnishing them, however, the Navy will be compelled to reduce correspondingly the amount of radar protection furnished by vessels of this character to the operating forces at sea.

After deducting the value of existing equipment and the cost of the picket vessels, there remains a total estimated cost of about \$112,000,000, for which the Air Force will have to obtain new funds. This sum consists of the \$85,500,000 for which authorization for construction is

sought in the present bill, and also of an item of about \$26,000,000 representing the cost of new radar and communications equipment, authority for the procurement of which exists independently of this bill.

This program has been considered by intelligence agencies looking at our strategic make-up from the point of view of a possible enemy. It will not furnish absolute protection, but it will give us a reasonable degree of protection where protection is needed at a cost which the economy of this country can sustain. Moreover, it represents a balanced program in which this particular project is in balance with other armed services' projects. It takes account also of the great strategic importance of Alaska where existing radar facilities are totally and wholly inadequate. In this connection, I might say also that testimony was received during the hearings from responsible officers of the Air Force to the effect that words would be impossible to describe how poor our radar defenses in the continental United States are today. This program has been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget.

In view of the fact that this particular legislation is designed merely to authorize the construction of the necessary public works, the Committee on Armed Services believes it appropriate to limit the authorization contained in this bill to \$85,500,000. The bill has been amended accordingly, but with the clear understanding and intent that this limitation shall apply only to construction costs and will in no way limit the cost of procurement or installation of radar and communications equipment or other technical equipment required to establish an operational system in being. It is intended that this limitation shall apply expressly and exclusively to construction costs alone. The Committee on Armed Services and its staff has made a very careful and thoroughgoing study and analysis of the pending legislation. Prior to the hearings, a comprehensive list of written questions pertaining to almost every conceivable question which might arise in connection with this bill was submitted to each of the three armed services, and written replies were requested. Much of the information furnished in response to these queries was classified and hence cannot be made available. However, those replies which did not require classification for reasons of military security have been printed in the hearings and may be found at pages 352 to 359.

Complete and exhaustive hearings were held before the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, and by the full committee, and in both instances a motion to report the bill favorably was carried unanimously.

Despite the fact that a great deal of the information pertaining to this bill and obtained both during the hearings and in answer to the written questions is of a highly classified nature, I believe the Members of the House will find ample justification for this legislation in the open hearings and the committee report.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

At the outset I wish to compliment the able and distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] for his concise and clear presentation of this legislation. Any further remarks as to the purposes of this bill are unnecessary.

I would state, however, that this legislation comes to the floor by a unanimous vote of the committee. There is no opposition on the part of the minority members. All agree that it is essential that land-based air warning and control installations should be installed as soon as possible for our national security. It is recommended by the Department of the Air Force and all other defense-minded agencies, including the Aviation Policy Committee of the Eightieth Congress.

I urge the unanimous adoption of this legislation.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress in its report dated March 1, 1948, entitled "Senate Report No. 949" had the following to say, as a fifth recommendation:

There should be established a joint task group designed to withstand an initial attack directed at the United States and to form the basic organization for a strong territorial defense. Defense plans must contemplate an aggressive attack designed to cripple our centers of war potential. In the current atomic age it may be expected that such attacks on the United States will be delivered by air with little or no warning. Now is the time to organize the internal defenses in order to localize and repel such an attack. It is imperative that an air-warning network be extended in all directions from which an attack may be expected. Economy may be achieved by employing elements of the civil-airways system wherever practicable.

Then, with reference to recommendation No. 6:

A competent aircraft-warning network should be established under the direction and control of the proposed territorial command. An aircraft-warning network is composed essentially of long-range surveillance radar and a system of rapid communication. As much of this system as can be employed feasibly and integrated into the civil-airways traffic-control system should be so employed. This will provide economy by avoiding duplication as well as providing a reservoir of highly skilled operators and technicians in an emergency.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to the floor of the House to authorize the construction of those works necessary for the Military Establishment in connection with the early-warning network intended to cover the United States. There is also being set up in the Civil Aeronautics Administration a system which will employ radar in civil-airways traffic control. As much of that system and its communication system as are possible to be employed jointly and in conjunction with the Military Establishment in the event of war is intended to be so employed that as much of the product of the funds that are so expended by the people of the United States may

be employed in the interests of national defense. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has under its jurisdiction several transcontinental circuitously laid teletype lines. There are a great many radio stations in conjunction with it, and, jointly between these two services in the event of an attack, we may expect the best possible warning that can be obtained.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I might say to the gentleman that we took that into consideration in arriving at the conclusions on this bill. Of course, the gentleman understands there are many things about this program that are off the record and classified as military secrets. But does not the gentleman, with the experience that he has had with this matter, and I believe he is fully qualified to answer this question, believe that the continental United States gets more defense out of this one thing than any other thing that has come before us in the last several years?

Mr. HINSHAW. I can say this to the gentleman, and I am not repeating anything that has not been heretofore published when I say it, that tests made at Eglin Field Air Base of the United States Air Force have indicated that the B-36 when flying at altitudes of 40,000 feet or over can hardly be intercepted at the present time by the best type of interceptor aircraft that we have. These airplanes at an altitude of 40,000 feet will fly at the rate of approximately 6 miles a minute. It takes 26 minutes for the best fighter interceptors we have got, to get off the ground and get to that altitude. If you multiply 6 by 26 you will find we will not be able to meet an oncoming plane of the character of the B-36 at 40,000 feet altitude unless you know about it when that plane is at least 155 miles away from its target. Consequently, to make ourselves really more safe, we should know about it a great deal more than 155 miles away from any potential target. We should know about it, if possible, an hour away from its target, if not more.

Furthermore, we should be able to trap an oncoming bomber and know its direction, determine its altitude and its speed and the approximate target which it may have as its objective.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman well knows this equipment can be placed on that type of bomber.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, it can be placed on that type of bomber, but you cannot keep them in the air all the time. The equipment that the gentleman is providing in this bill is intended to be ground equipment, as I understand it.

There is a bill coming up right after this bill, in connection with guided missiles. There is considerable question in the minds of those who are engaged in this study at the present time as to whether or not a bomber of the quality and character of the B-36, or some others that are on the drawing board today, can be intercepted at all by human-

manned aircraft. It is quite possible that the only way they may be properly intercepted is through ground-to-air guided missiles likewise equipped with radar.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Of course our latest bombers, the Boeing XP-47, which flew 2,289 miles recently from Moses Lake, Wash., to Andrews Airfield at a speed of approximately 610 miles an hour, is really faster than most of our interceptors today?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is perfectly true, but that kind of a bomber is not going to go over the North Pole and strike the United States right away, because they do not have the range.

Mr. SHORT. It will take time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Unfortunately for the airplane, it consumes fuel at a rate that increases in proportion to the square of the speed of the aircraft. There are distinct limits both upon the speed and the range of the aircraft in accordance with the amount of fuel that can be carried, and so forth. But you will remember that back in 1934 there were three Russian aircraft that flew over the North Pole and landed in the United States. One of those planes landed in the State of Oregon. The other two landed in southern California, if you please. It is perfectly possible to fly clear across those poles within limits. The less speed, the farther you can fly. Of course, you may say, "We do not need to worry about the slow-speed aircraft," but if you do not know they are there, what are you going to do about it? They can be over the target before you have any idea they are coming. Hence the vital importance of establishing this great early-warning network, not only in the continental United States but in other parts of the North American Continent, and extending the cooperative efforts with other departments of the National Defense Agency into other areas than the actual continent itself.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. We were assured that there was very close cooperation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure there is.

I remember last year it was promised there would be complete cooperation in the continental defense command and in the seas adjoining the continental limits of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the scope and purpose of this legislation has been fully explained. I rise for the purpose of underscoring what has been said regarding the importance of the measure, particularly in strategic spots, like Alaska. After several years of study a definite plan and program for an aircraft warning and control system in the United States and Alaska have been finalized by the Air Force and reviewed and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense.

The bill authorizes the expenditure of \$85,500,000. This authorization applies only to expenditures for buildings, facilities, utilities, and similar expenses, but does not include the cost of radar and communications equipment. Authorization for those expenditures is already in the law, and the Appropriations Committee is authorized to act under existing law.

It has been pointed out that necessary radar and communications equipment to be provided will cost an additional \$26,000,000. Moreover, existing radar equipment valued at \$42,250,000 will be available for allocation for use in this radar warning system.

"WHO HOLDS ALASKA HOLDS THE WORLD"

Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself in particular to the importance of this measure in connection with the defense of what is perhaps the most vital of all our strategic spots today—Alaska. A good many years ago the famed air general, Billy Mitchell, said that "who holds Alaska holds the world." How right he was and how prophetic was his vision.

There is no question today but that Alaska is woefully underdefended. There is no secret about that fact. The Alaskan Command has publicly stated that the Territory is presently vulnerable to enemy thrust and that the defenses are presently inadequate to repel a possible attack. General Spaatz has stated:

Provided with bases close to the Arctic area, an enemy could attack the most important cities of the United States, and, inversely, American bombing forces located close to the sixty-fifth parallel of north latitude could carry out reprisals of the same nature against the most important centers of population of any possible enemy.

That means that, operating from bases in Fairbanks, for example, enemy bombers could bomb most of the industrial heart of America.

The fall of China to the Chinese Communist armies, thereby bringing China under Communist pressure and Soviet Union influence, if not control, threatening to engulf the larger part of the Asiatic land mass, changes the complexion of the entire Pacific area and lays bare the weaknesses of our Alaskan defenses. A glance at the map reveals the fact that thousands of miles separate the California coast from the Asiatic mainland in the deeper latitudes. But the mainland of Alaska is only 56 miles from the Soviet Union, across the Bering Strait.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, it is well to point out that the security of Alaska is the security of the great circle, the most efficient air route to the Orient. A further glance at the polar map shows that the Aleutian chain stretches along this air route toward the Kamchatka Peninsula, to Japan, China, and the Philippines. This main air route to the Orient uses Anchorage, Alaska, as an important base.

RUSSIA IS ACTIVE IN SIBERIA

In considering the over-all problem of defending Alaska from possible attack, it is well to recall that the Russians are thoroughly familiar with most of the airfields and installations in the Alaskan

area. During the war more than 7,000 lend-lease planes were delivered to Russian fliers at Fairbanks. Quite a large number of Russian officers and men were kept there during much of the war and others received training in the Aleutians.

We do not know what the Russians are doing with regard to their military installations in Siberia in the vicinity of Alaska, but we do have good reason to believe there is much activity in that area. We know that Russia's Eulenspiegel Field is only some 200 miles from Nome. We know that the Soviet base of Anadyr, on the Siberian coast, is in that immediate vicinity. We know that not since 1944 has an American plane been permitted to fly across that area, en route to Moscow via Alaska and Siberia. We know that the Russians now hold the former Japanese naval base of Paramushira, which is only 716 miles from the Alaska Aleutian chain. And we have good reason to believe that an all-out industrial-development program is taking place in Siberia, with stepped-up military preparedness activities being pushed ever closer to the Bering Straits. According to Maj. Gen. William E. Kepner, of the United States Air Force, the Russians across the Bering Straits are very likely conducting tests of men and equipment similar to our own experiments.

ALASKAN DEFENSE NEEDS

Now, in order to carry out plans for the defense of Alaska, there are three important considerations:

First. A comprehensive warning system, such as is contemplated in the bill we are now considering.

Second. The deployment of more troops, equipment, and airplanes to Alaskan bases.

Third. More adequate housing in order to make possible such deployment and in order to make more effective the best utilization of the radar screen in the Arctic area.

It is certainly important that we recognize the danger of relying too much upon the presence of radar and other installations and not forget the human element which is necessary to operate them effectively. The more we build up our Alaskan defenses, the more we shall need personnel to man and protect the equipment for possible defensive and offensive warfare.

Mr. Chairman, we can no longer think of Alaska as a sort of sentry-base. Alaska is likely to be a major base in any future war. There is every reason to believe that such a war would see planes and missiles sent back and forth across the North Pole. Arctic tests of such equipment, as the Air Force has announced, are going on in Alaska this winter.

MUST THINK IN TERMS OF EAST AND WEST

In our last two wars, the United States sent its strength around the wide circumference of the earth, east and west across the oceans in the traditional and conventional concept of a flat projection of our planet. That geographical concept is archaic and abruptly we are faced with the military need to reorient our thinking in terms of east and west alone, and to start thinking of the different pic-

ture which the earth presents looking north and south across the polar cap. In the last war, for example, we used Africa as a stepping stone to Europe, and Australia was on our route to Asia. But if we look at the world from the Arctic region, we see that Europe and Siberia lie almost next door—between North America and Africa, the Sudan, India, Indochina, the East Indies, or Australia. This is a whole new view of geography, and we must learn to think in these terms if only because the Soviet Union is assuredly thinking in them.

I am thinking of national defense plans in relation to the only great power with which our country could be forced into conflict at this stage of history. This is the air age and we have placed our hopes for peace largely on air power; in consequence, as part of our planning for peace we must turn our thinking toward Alaska.

I have spoken of possible attacks by air. But there is no guaranty that an attack would come by air alone. I was interested in reading a recent statement by Maj. Alexander de Seversky, a well-known aviation writer. In This Week magazine he singled out the Alaska-Kamchatka area as the only one in which, during another war, sea and land warfare would also be important. Major de Seversky cannot be accused of bias in favor of the importance of land and sea forces as compared with air power, and for him to make such a statement is significant.

ARCTIC TESTS ARE BEING MADE

But without attaching too much weight to any one commentator, we can all agree that the defense of Alaska is of the utmost importance. In recent months the Air Force has announced its testing under Arctic conditions of radio-controlled bombs and of the B-36 long-range bomber. These tests in Alaska, it is interesting to note, follow the tests given under artificially manufactured cold weather down at Eglin Air Force Base, in Florida. It was recently found—as just one example of many which come up during actual service tests in the Arctic—that Arctic duty produced an effect upon the tires not discovered during the previous tests at Eglin Air Force Base. Ordinarily, the tires of a plane upon landing are temporarily flattened and quickly resume their shape. But in the Alaskan tests of one plane the flattened tire froze and remained flat. These and other difficulties will be ironed out in present and future tests.

About a year and a half ago the Air Force announced that flights by Alaska-based squadrons had proved that Air Force units could fly anywhere in the polar regions during any season of the year. I am informed that already years of work, millions of flying miles and many millions of dollars, have gone into the work of testing material and personnel, observing and photo-mapping the Alaskan area for the strategic location of defenses.

ALASKAN COMMAND DOING GOOD JOB

The armed forces in the Territory, I believe, have done a good job with the resources and equipment available. The joint command of the services in Alaska has been unified, with Lt. Gen. Nathan

F. Twining, an Air Force officer, as commander in chief for Alaska, and Rear Adm. A. E. Montgomery as deputy commander. Army Alaska is commanded by Maj. Gen. B. L. Scott, an engineering officer, and the Alaskan air command, formerly under Maj. Gen. J. H. Atkinson, is now under Brig. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong.

The teamwork among these officers has been carried down the line to various bases and installations, each of which likewise has a unified command.

What is the present state, however, of Alaska's defenses? According to a New York Times dispatch of last February 14, the 586,400 square miles of the Territory, with its coast line of 33,000 miles, is defended by one antiaircraft battalion, a few B-29's—which are actually weather and photographic planes, about one group of Air Force jet fighters, one squadron of all-weather fighters, and a few naval patrol planes. There are no infantrymen and no combat ships, according to this report, permanently assigned to its defense. The military personnel of all services are chiefly members of supply, service, experimental or testing units, or staff and headquarters units.

HOUSING SHORTAGE IS ACUTE

The deployment of additional units, I am informed by the Air Force, waits upon the provision of additional housing. After the completion of housing now under way at Elmendorf and Ladd Air Force Bases, and the erection of temporary barracks authorized for Eielson Air Force Base, there will still be a shortage of space for 4,700 troops.

Those troops we now have in Alaska are in many cases inadequately housed. This was my own observation during a trip to Alaska last October, and I am pleased to have it confirmed by the New York Times reporter, Hanson W. Baldwin, who wrote on February 13 from Anchorage as follows:

Nowhere has this correspondent seen soldiers and airmen and their wives living in such squalid, ramshackle huts as pass by the name of houses here.

At Eielson Air Force Base, near Fairbanks, in the interior, an Air Force inspector recently reported that enlisted personnel were housed in Pacific-type huts—built for a very different climate—in most cases inadequately heated, poorly lighted, and crowded. The latrines were a long way from the huts, and at winter temperatures of 20 to 45 degrees below zero, their walls and floors stayed covered with ice.

The shortage of space—even after present construction is completed—for some 4,700 additional troops is based upon emergency living-space conditions of 50 square feet per man. It does not allow for expansion to normal peacetime quarters of a personnel already stationed there. Ordinary peacetime space allowances run from 72 square feet for privates to larger spaces for higher ranks; in Alaska, the average allowance should be something like 90 square feet per man, compared with the 50 square feet which is provided. And the Arctic is not a good place in which to cut the soldier's living space. In this long, dark winter,

and sparsely settled country, most of his off-duty time must be spent indoors. This means, in practice, that a soldier coming inside from temperatures of 20 degrees or more below zero, to a heated barracks, is confined there to a space 5 by 10 feet or less. This area is largely taken up already by his bunk. When he takes off the heavy parka, boots, and other outside clothing and hangs them up, there is hardly enough room left to turn around.

FAMILY QUARTERS NEEDED

Nor, Mr. Chairman, does the estimated shortage of barracks space on an emergency basis for 4,700 troops, which will still exist when current construction projects are completed, take into account the urgent need for family quarters for the men who are already there. There cannot be many areas in which this need is greater. Alaska is a long distance from the continental United States, and is itself an enormous Territory—stretching in length a distance about equal to the width of our country. It has less than 100,000 people and a handful of small towns and cities separated by hundreds of miles of wilderness. The leading towns are smaller than the military bases which are nearby, although their populations have already been swollen by the last war. They can offer very little accommodation to the soldier or civilian who wants to bring his family along. If you will imagine the most crowded boom town near the camps and war factories in the United States during the last war and multiply the shortage several times over, you will have a rough idea of the state of affairs.

At Eielson Air Force Base, which is some 26 miles out in the wilderness from Fairbanks, a town of about 8,000 people, the requirements for family housing are spaced to house 345 officers' dependents, and 1,282 dependents of enlisted men. The actual provisions for such housing now provide for a total of 16 dependents, in converted Quonset huts. At the other bases, the shortage of family quarters is almost as great.

Mr. Chairman, I have spent some time referring to the housing problem in Alaska. I saw some of it under favorable weather conditions, and I can testify the acute shortage applies also to civilians. The shortage has made it very difficult for the armed services to recruit the number or quality of civilian technicians needed. The bases are like small cities—for Alaska, they are big cities—each with its public utilities, streets, heating, telephones, and so on, to be operated best, most economically and efficiently by trained civilians. But capable technicians of the sort who are most needed can seldom be persuaded to leave their homes and families in the United States for civil service pay and dormitory life in the Arctic. I was informed that the annual turn-over of those civilian employees runs more than 100 percent.

The services have done their best to provide for all these needs with their available funds. The Air Force, for example, gives priority to Alaska in all its housing schedules. But it is costly to

house forces in the Arctic. Because of the need to import labor and shipbuilding materials from the United States, and because of changes in design needed in areas of permanent frost, construction costs on the average are two and a half to four times the cost of comparable housing in the United States. For example, cement delivered in Alaska has cost \$60 per barrel and in Seattle the cost is only \$15.

Mr. Chairman, funds should be provided with the minimum of delay to meet all the needs I have mentioned: first, for additional barracks to permit the deployment of additional forces, and as soon as possible to permit the men now overcrowded to spread out into a normal space; second, to replace the present temporary barracks—rapidly wearing out—which house 11,000 men; and, third, to provide family housing for an estimated total of 5,600 dependents and housing for civilian technicians.

HOUSING SHORTAGE OBSTRUCTING DEFENSE PLANS

All these shortages, the Air Force informs me, have combined so far to prevent deployment of forces in the desired numbers, to retard the training programs, to lower the morale of the personnel, and cause difficulty in securing enough civilian specialists. Thus, the lack of adequate housing in Alaska has already seriously interfered with national defense at one of its most strategic points.

Let us not be lulled into false security by legislation such as the radar bill, nor by reports of technical progress in planes, guided missiles, or other weapons which may be used in possible future battles over the top of the world. These things by themselves do not win wars. They must be operated, and defended, by men on the ground, who must have adequate quarters for life in the Arctic regions.

In the hands of an enemy, Alaska would be as frightful a menace as it is now an asset and a safeguard. We have only to remember our brief taste of such a danger during the last war when the Japanese obtained a lodgment on the Aleutian Islands. This Aleutian episode, costly as it was in life and treasure, was only a feeble slap compared to the devastating blow which the United States would suffer from the loss of Alaska in a future war.

ALASKA HAS BRIGHT FUTURE

Mr. Chairman, before concluding I should like to put in a good word for Alaska generally and its future. It has many attractions, great opportunities for outdoor recreation, and remarkable resources for industry and agriculture. One of its main drawbacks has been lack of transportation facilities. Alaska raises only 10 percent of its food. Its roads are limited and inadequate. Many of its resources have been exploited. But it is still a virgin country with tremendous possibilities for the future. I am hoping for ultimate peace rather than ultimate war, and I am sure that our present military investment in Alaska can some day be repaid many times over by the future growth and development

of this magnificent territory. There is no better place to build for the future.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, in support of this bill, H. R. 2546, which is to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force of the United States to establish land-based air warning and control installations, in the interest of our national security, and for other purposes, I speak briefly and yet emphatically and most sincerely for its unanimous approval.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of this House, I have sat at hearings on this proposal and, therefore, had the benefit and advantage of hearing all of the testimony of the expert witnesses who appeared before us in support of the bill's objectives.

As the witnesses testify, and as this bill is to be voted upon, I specifically call your attention to the text of the report accompanying this bill and to the fact, on page 2 thereof, that one of the functions of the United States Air Force is as follows, to wit—item 8 of section 6:

To develop, in coordination with the other services, doctrines, procedures, and equipment for air defense from land areas, including the continental United States.

One particular phrase in this item which I desire to emphasize to your attention is that the function of the Air Force, in developing equipment for land areas, is that it shall make such developments in coordination with other services. I am sure that the taxpayers of the United States are very much pleased at every point where they find that there is coordination with the other services, and, as a Member of this great Congress, I am particularly pleased that the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense have repeatedly and clearly urged that there shall be unification and coordination between the services which are described as our Military Establishment.

I believe that the people of the United States will not be found wanting in a willingness to furnish all of the funds necessary for our adequate national defenses; but, Mr. Chairman, I also believe that the taxpayers of the United States clearly expect and anticipate that wherever duplication, rivalry, or overlapping of expenses or efforts for the same thing can be eliminated, without lessening the efficiency or progress of our national defense, those duplications or expenditures which so largely use the most of our tax dollar should be eliminated.

No doubt, in a peculiar way, and may I say possibly a personal way, I have been and am interested in the support of the worthy objectives of this bill, for the reason that my own distinguished son in his lifetime was a lieutenant in the Army Air Force, in the Aleutians-Alaska area, and he being a war casualty, I naturally remember more specifically some of the things he told me about the beneficent effects and results of radar, in connection with the Air Force's use of it in the Aleutians-Alaska area. I also remember his emphatic statement to me, the last time I talked with him, that our Nation must

properly and adequately erect, construct, and maintain what he termed to me as a "radar picket fence." Naturally therefore, based upon his expert testimony to me, through his many years' experience in flying in the defense of our country, together with the expert testimony of the witnesses before our subcommittee, I find myself being in the unusually satisfactory position of being in support of this bill. I expect and anticipate that every Member of this House will vote for it; it deserves the unanimous vote of all Members.

In closing, may I briefly say that during the political campaign, by the result of which I was elected to return to this Congress, having served previously in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I used a slogan of mine which was, "A safe and sound America in a world at peace." It appears appropriate for me to repeat that slogan here, today, for the reason that, as the world now is, there appears that there can be no safe America without this radar fence. It further appears that there can be no sound America without being safe from aggression and until the world settles down enough to realize that the world citizens must live together in terms of peace, if they are to live at all. Lastly, the world must live at peace, because, in the presence of the rapidly expanding development of technological discoveries, there can be no survival of civilized man unless there is world peace. I pray God that it may not be a peace which comes primarily as a result of world fear, but for the present and until there is actually, essentially, and fundamentally a peaceful world, our great Nation must remain strong enough, in a military sense, to do its fullest share to prevent a world catastrophe to civilization which would surely be the result of any ungodly, crazy aggression, initiated in the world.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wish you and my colleagues to understand that my interpretation and the emphasis I place upon being militarily strong is that our beloved Nation must never be the aggressor; but must remain strong enough militarily to fulfill to the fullest our mission and responsibility toward world peace, which is our keeping a mental attitude and spiritual conception of our world relationships which dictate that we shall never be the aggressor with our military forces, but that we shall be and remain sufficiently strong to insure that there is a safe and sound America in a world at peace.

In conclusion, I feel certain that you will join with me in reiterating that we hope and pray that every resource within the strength of the United Nations organization will be given such latitude, force, and effect that through the United Nations organization there shall more speedily come a world status of world understanding and cooperation which will reasonably insure a fixed and enduring world peace, which shall make possible and reasonable a much earlier de-emphasis upon the need of military strength than any of us can now conceive. I pray God that this status of a safe and sound America in a world of peace shall be steadily in our minds, in our hearts, and in our prayers.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to establish and develop within and without the continental limits of the United States in fulfilling the air defense responsibilities of the Department of the Air Force such land-based air warning and control installations and facilities, by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, utilities, and access roads, and to provide for necessary administration and planning therefor, without regard to sections 1136, 3648, 3734, Revised Statutes, as he may deem necessary in the interest of national security.

SEC. 2. In furtherance of the above, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to make surveys and to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, and to place permanent and temporary improvements thereon, whether such lands are held in fee or under lease, or under other temporary tenure.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and when so specified in an appropriation act such amounts shall remain available until expended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, after line 4, insert the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$85,500,000 shall be appropriated for the construction of public works authorized by this section."

Page 2, after line 20, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 4. The provisions of this act shall be subject to the duties and authority of the Secretary of Defense and the departments and agencies of the National Military Establishment as provided in the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 129, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. JOHNSON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with regard to the late Senator Broughton.

LONG-RANGE GUIDED MISSILES PROVING GROUND

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee, I call up House Resolution 128.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1741 is a companion bill to the one just passed. It provides that the Secretary of the Air Force shall be authorized to establish long-range proving grounds for guided missiles and other weapons by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities within or without the continental limits of the United States.

There was no opposition to this bill in the Committee on Rules, and it came out of the Committee on the Armed Services with a unanimous vote.

I was particularly interested in an article which appeared in a New York paper the other day in regard to this very thing. The article was the result of an interview with Air Force Secretary Symington. The article reads as follows:

While we cannot predict the exact role which guided missiles may play in any future war, we must do all we can to make certain such a conflict will not find the United States lagging behind.

The Air Force's research and development program in guided missiles aims to develop weapons to aid the primary Air Force mission.

This primary mission calls for the maintenance of air power to defend us from aerial attack, to provide tactical support for ground forces, and to wage strategic warfare to destroy the enemy's capacity to wage war and his will to fight.

The possibilities of guided missiles became clear toward the end of World War II when

the Germans used, with considerable effect, the V-1 and V-2. We used radio-controlled bombs with effect.

MAY REPLACE BOMBS

Experts now estimate that within 10 years guided missiles may replace airborne guns and bombs. Within 15 years they predict we may have surface-to-surface guided missiles which can play important roles in tactical and strategic bombardment.

Since the war, we have conducted exhaustive research on all types of guided missiles. We are now beginning to develop selected projects which will produce high-performance missiles in various categories.

We confidently expect air-to-air and surface-to-air missiles will increase greatly our ability to ward off air attacks; that air-to-surface missiles and surface-to-surface missiles will be necessary to effective counterattacks.

Air-to-surface guided missiles are being developed which can strike with high accuracy. The first, soon to be furnished to our combat groups, are bombs weighing 12,000 pounds or more.

RELIES ON GRAVITY

This missile, an improvement on our radio-controlled bomb, relies on gravity and can be deviated in its course by electronic controls. It will be valuable in support of ground forces where precision bombing is all-important.

Next will come self-propelled missiles which can be launched from airplanes flying beyond the enemy's highly defended areas. Powered by rocket or ram-jet and flying at supersonic speeds, the missile may be electronically guided in any of several ways. Designed for long-range strategic bombing, it will be ready for use in the next few years.

Our bombers carrying these missiles to the launching point will use for defense air-to-air missiles similar to those designed for our interceptor fighters for use in breaking up air attacks.

SEE 10,000-MILE RANGE

A time may come when surface-to-surface missiles will go as far as 10,000 miles from the launching site. Such a weapon, we feel, must be one of accuracy rather than one like the V-2, capable only of area bombardment.

It must be able to deliver a knock-out blow on a specific target if it is to repay the vast expenditures of man-hours and materials invested.

This Nation has the technical experts and the industrial capacity for leadership in guided-missile development and employment. Helping to achieve and continue in that leadership to safeguard international peace is a prime concern of the United States Air Force.

Our present launching site for guided missiles is only about 150 miles long, but within the present year the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy, will have missiles that will go beyond 500 miles. Immediate action on this bill is necessary so construction can be started on testing grounds for missiles already manufactured that will travel over 500 miles. It is predicted by the experts that within a very few years we will have missiles that will go as far as three to four thousand miles.

This appropriation originally was for \$200,000,000, but it was reduced to \$75,000,000 for the purpose of getting immediate action on the installation of these necessary proving grounds for the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side of the aisle on this rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1471, with Mr. KARSTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill bears the unanimous endorsement of the national defense establishments. It bears the endorsement of the Office of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force. It has been approved by the budget. It was approved unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. It comes to you today without opposition that I know about.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons by the construction, installation, and equipment of necessary public works, either temporary or permanent, within or without the continental limits of the United States.

This proving ground is to be used jointly by the Army, Navy, and Air Force for scientific study, testing, and training purposes. It is a joint venture of the three armed services, because all services have a need, in varying degree, for such a facility. Moreover, from the inception of this project, each service has had equal representation in all phases of the planning.

In discussing this project, it would be desirable if we were able to predict exactly the relative importance of guided missiles in any possible future conflict. Unfortunately, we cannot at this time make such exact predictions as to the role which guided missiles will play in the future. The potentialities of these new weapons, however, were clearly indicated in the latter stages of World War II, when the Germans employed, with considerable effect, the V-1 and V-2 surface-to-surface missiles, and we ourselves employed radio-controlled bombs. I might say in this connection that the V-1, or buzz bomb, as it is popularly known, was not a guided missile in the strict sense of the term, because, if I am not mistaken, no means had been developed by the Germans by which its flight could be controlled or altered in any way to suit changing conditions, once the weapon had been launched. In other words, the V-1 was merely a pro-

jected but not a guided missile. I believe the same may also have been true of the V-2, a high-altitude rocket, which was employed with limited but nonetheless devastating effect in the latter stages of the war in Europe.

The weapons used in World War II, however, might be compared roughly to the aircraft used during World War I; they were of a crude and elementary character, but, nevertheless, their importance in the recent conflict is outweighed by their significance as forerunners of things to come in the future. Indeed, our experts in the field of guided missiles believe it quite likely that within 10 years we will be replacing present guns and bombs by guided missiles, and that within 15 years weapons of this character will have been perfected to the extent that they will have important applications in the field of tactical and strategic bombardment operations. These ultimate potentialities cannot possibly be realized, however, unless we pursue energetically the tasks which lie before us in research and development and operational experimentation and training.

During the hearings before the subcommittee which considered this legislation, testimony was received from Dr. Karl T. Compton, Chairman of the Research and Development Board, who gave the committee a very helpful description of some of the terms in daily usage in the field of guided missiles and the general problems and principles involved. Dr. Compton's remarks were of particular assistance in view of the fact that many important facts pertaining to this legislation must necessarily be classified for reasons of military security. For this reason, I believe it may be of assistance to some of the Members if I repeat to you some of the information which Dr. Compton furnished to us in open session. In that way I can be on safe ground, reasonably assured against the danger of venturing into those areas where security must prevail.

Dr. Compton has defined a guided missile as "an unmanned vehicle moving above the earth's surface, whose trajectory or flight path is capable of being altered by a mechanism within the vehicle."

By mutual consent, the services have further subdivided guided missiles into four categories according to the manner of launching and the location of the target. These are: Surface-to-surface, surface-to-air, air-to-air, and air-to-surface. A surface-to-surface guided missile, for example, is one which is launched from the ground or from a ship and is thence steered during its flight to strike its distant target, which may be an enemy ship or factory or other military objective on the ground or sea. An air-to-surface missile would be one launched from an airplane against a target on the surface of the earth, either on land or sea, and moving or stationary. Note particularly that we do not include ordinary bombs, shells, or bullets, as these missiles do not incorporate an internal mechanism to influence their trajectory.

The proving ground under discussion today is required primarily for the completion of research and development work on guided missiles with ranges

greater than 150 miles, for which no facility now exists in this country.

To further explain guided missiles as compared to conventional shells or bombs and at the risk of oversimplification, let us consider the action of these two types of missiles. The artillery shell or bullet is fired from a gun at high velocity. After firing, it is influenced only by atmospheric conditions and gravity. In both cases, accuracy of the initial aim plus prediction of atmospheric conditions and possible movement of the target are the factors that determine a hit or miss.

The guided missile, on the other hand, usually has incorporated in it a motor which takes over after launching and accelerates the missile or continues it at a constant speed for an extended period of time, thereby increasing its range. Various internal mechanisms may be used to provide guidance and control to the missile while in flight. These mechanisms are controlled in various ways by outside influences, such as by radio or radar, as one example. The missile may have some kind of seeing eye which automatically steers it to its target after it has come within a few miles of its objective.

By these means, a missile can fly a predetermined course to a target, recognize it, and make final alterations to its course, in order to deliver the warhead within the target area. All this will be done eventually at supersonic speeds to reduce the possibility of enemy defense against it. This oversimplified description of a guided missile is, in no sense, what we have today, but is what we are working toward. At the same time, however, I will state that none of the features so briefly described are considered insurmountable by American science, and all are in an encouraging state of development.

A test range is an area within which the experimental guided missiles can be tested in flight to study their over-all performance and the behavior of all their parts—wings, motors, electronic equipment, rudders, stabilizers, and so forth. By such tests, faults can be identified and corrected, adjustments perfected, and alternative methods of operation compared. Without the benefit of such tests, the manufactured missiles would be so unreliable that the money spent on their development would be largely wasted.

An important term that is used repeatedly in connection with test ranges is instrumentation. This term is applied to the integrated system of devices used at a range to acquire the test data. One function or element of the instrumentation system is called telemetering, which may be described as the transmission of data from the missile to the ground by electrical means. It is essential that the scientist who is developing a missile know exactly what is happening within it at all times. Telemetering data tell us how engines, control surfaces, and other mechanisms of the missile are functioning, and whether the missile is rolling, tumbling, or deviating from its course. These data are picked up at various ground instrumentation stations located at intervals along the predicted flight path.

In connection with instrumentation, I would like to use this illustration. You all know the instrumentation panel which is in front of a pilot of an airplane, which gives the performance of the motor, his compass, and all the details that he needs to know about the functioning of the instruments. It is by means of the readings on those instruments that he properly controls his craft. In a guided missile there is no pilot present who can see those things, but it is necessary to have that same kind of information. Therefore, the instruments are put in the guided missile but, instead of having the pilot in the missile to look at the instruments, all the readings of those instruments are sent down to the ground by some kind of radio control and are reproduced in instruments on the ground so that the observer there sees what is going on in the plane just as if he were sitting in an imaginary cockpit in the guided missile and looking at the instruments themselves. That is what is known as the telemetering device.

In addition to the telemetering receivers at each station, special electronic instruments are necessary to track the missile throughout its flight to continually indicate its position in space, as well as high-speed cameras to take pictures of the launching and early part of the flight.

At the conclusion of a flight, a study of the data thus obtained gives a complete picture of what happened to the missile during its entire flight. Even the simplest missile, made to test a particular component of the finished product, costs many thousands of dollars. The more complicated may well run into the hundreds of thousands. This reason alone makes it absolutely essential for both economy and success that a flight-test range have adequate instrumentation to produce the data necessary in the experimental work connected with the development of guided missiles.

The project for the long-range guided missiles proving ground had its inception about 3 years ago when the Guided Missiles Committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recognized the necessity for a test range much longer than any existing facility; the maximum range at any present facility is 150 miles. The matter was, therefore, turned over to the Joint Research and Development Board which promptly established in the fall of 1946, the Committee on Long-Range Proving Ground, of which Brig. Gen. William L. Richardson, United States Air Force, was chairman. This committee consisted of representatives from the Army, Navy, and Air Force and was assigned as its mission the "examination of the entire question of a single, national, long-range guided missiles proving ground."

That committee determined first, that there exists an urgent requirement for such a facility and, secondly, as a result of its studies, established the necessary characteristics of an ideal proving ground.

As a result of investigation, it was found that a facility of this character would have to be located in a relatively isolated area for reasons of safety and security. It was found also that the ultimate development of the program would

require an eventual community of 13,000 inhabitants, consisting of 5,000 military and civilian employees and an estimated 8,000 dependents. Due to the necessity of establishing the installation in a sparsely populated area, it is necessary to provide to a minimum degree housing, shopping, schools, and other necessities of American life.

Testimony was received during the hearings before our subcommittee to the effect that plans for initial construction do not contemplate accommodating 13,000 persons. Only the minimum essential facilities will be included in the initial installation.

The required facilities for a long-range guided missile proving ground may be divided into three main groups:

First. A base area with suitable launching site, technical and administrative facilities.

Second. Instrumentation range at least 3,000 miles long, thoroughly instrumented by means of observation stations for the first 500 miles, and with impact areas at various points along the line of flight.

Third. A suitable climate for year-round operations. Existing guided-missile proving grounds are not capable of expansion in length to accomplish the task of testing missiles at longer ranges than 150 miles. Installations now in operation are those at White Sand-Alamogordo in New Mexico; Point Mugu and Inyokern in California. Even apart from the inability of these facilities to handle longer range missiles, a survey of the work loads of existing ranges by an independent committee of the Research and Development Board has disclosed that they will be saturated during the next few years. The services have agreed, therefore, that the long-range proving ground may be used to test shorter range missiles so long as this work does not interfere with the primary long-range flight-test missions.

For reasons of military security, the location of the proposed long-range guided-missile proving ground cannot now be disclosed. However, it has been ascertained that there will be no serious likelihood of hazard to persons or property, or of interference with private and commercial interests in connection with the test flying of missiles on the proposed range. The danger will be very small because every possible precaution will be taken. Means will be provided to dispose of missiles in the air, over a safe area, should they deviate too far off course. Normally they will fly so high as to be impossible of detection except with special instruments. From a safety standpoint they will be no more dangerous than conventional airplanes flying overhead, and from a nuisance standpoint they will be less objectionable. Most important of all, the test range will be located in a region so sparsely inhabited in the areas where there might be any danger that the hazard will be wholly negligible.

The need for a facility of this type is urgent. Experts in the field are convinced that guided missiles with ranges in the hundreds of miles and accuracies acceptable to the military can be de-

veloped. Their development is dependent upon the existence of a suitable range on which to test them. The guided-missile development program is one of our largest research and development programs in which the investment to date has amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars. If work was started upon the construction of this facility today, it would be needed for testing missiles ready for flight tests before it could be placed in operation.

Missiles with ranges up to 500 miles will be ready for testing during 1949, without a range of sufficient length on which to fly them. If the services are unable to test these and other long-range missiles at time of completion, the entire schedule of research and development will be disrupted. Certain other nations have availed themselves of the services of German scientists and technicians and are making vigorous efforts to produce guided missiles of intercontinental ranges. The absence of suitable facilities in this country could easily make it possible for other nations to forge ahead of us in the development of long-range guided missiles.

In proposing the project to the Secretary of Defense, the Research and Development Board recommended that sponsorship of the project be assigned to the Air Force. Although the Air Force will have over-all responsibility for the range, each service will be appropriately represented at the operating level. Moreover, section 5 of the bill enables the Secretary of Defense to change the primary responsibility to either of the other services should he feel that such a change would better serve the National Military Establishment.

The proposed project is vigorously supported by the Army and by the Navy. These two services have expressed the view that all the services will enjoy significant advantages as a result of intimate association with all projects conducted at such a station; moreover, it is felt that this method of operation will be most economical.

The Navy has supported the project since its inception, both with material and personnel, and has assigned personnel to duty with the Air Force. In addition, the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department is presently engaged in making engineering studies and designs leading to the construction of all off-shore facilities.

The proposed legislation, as submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, would have authorized a total expenditure of \$200,000,000, which contemplates the eventual cost of the project. Testimony was received, however, to the effect that the first phase, representing the minimum requirements to begin operations, will require an estimated expenditure of at least \$70,000,000 over a period of approximately 3 years. A figure of \$60,000,000 was mentioned during consideration of the bill in open session by the subcommittee. This estimate, however, relates to technical requirements only and does not include the minimum requirements for housing and necessary community

facilities. A complete breakdown of costs furnished to the subcommittee in executive session fully supports the estimated figure of \$70,000,000.

Testimony further disclosed the fact that no accurate estimate can be made at this time as to the ultimate cost of construction which may be required during later phases of the long-range guided-missiles project; the ceiling of \$200,000,000 in the bill submitted by the National Military Establishment appears to have been merely an arbitrary figure selected at the request of the Bureau of the Budget. In view of these circumstances, the committee believes it appropriate to limit the authorization to the amount which will be required for the initial phase of the project. In setting such a figure, however, it is imperative that a reasonable margin of safety be allowed to provide for contingencies in order to insure that there will be no fiscal obstacles to the effective development of this vitally important facility. Taking into consideration the difficulty of estimating the exact cost of construction of certain highly technical elements and the possibility of fluctuating construction costs, the committee believes it appropriate at this time to fix the total authorization at \$75,000,000, and the bill has been amended accordingly.

The proposed legislation has the approval of the Secretary of Defense and of all three Departments of the National Military Establishment. In addition, it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The Committee on Armed Services unanimously recommends the enactment of this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee has done an excellent job of explaining a highly technical and restricted subject. There is no controversy on this bill; it is unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services, and we feel that it should be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I take pleasure in yielding to the sole surviving minority Member from the great State of Missouri, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], 5 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, being the only Republican Representative from Missouri is no new experience for me, for I was the lone wolf from that great State, the home of our President, in the Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, and Seventy-sixth Congresses; but I assure you it was an honor and distinction I did not ask for then, and I do not particularly cherish, relish, or enjoy the distinction now.

You know the greatest compensation for being a Member of this body is the rare and rich fellowship which we enjoy with our colleagues. I do not think we should wait until a man dies before saying nice things about him, particularly when he so well and so richly deserves them.

I am going to take advantage of this opportunity to say that though I have had the pleasure and privilege of working under several different chairmen of various committees of this House, all of them fine men, I have never served under a finer, abler, fairer, more effective chairman than the present chairman of our Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished and outstanding Member from Georgia, Hon. CARL VINSON. For over 36 years he has served his district, State, and Nation well in positions of high responsibility. Any person who can be returned election after election for more than a third of a century to the United States Congress has to possess many fine qualities. Through the prolonged and paralyzing depression, through the terrible and trying years of the war, and in this, the most difficult postwar period, the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, has been a great bulwark and stabilizing influence and inspiration to his colleagues who have worked with him.

Through his rich and long experience he has accumulated a fund of wisdom. Every member of our committee respects him for his character, admires him for his ability, and we all are grateful for his helpful cooperation. All of us benefit from his wise counsel and from his sound judgment. He is astute and resourceful. He knows men and how to deal with them.

Since I have been a Member of this body I can truthfully say I do not think there is any chairman who ever comes on this floor with a bill better prepared to explain and defend than is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. That is the reason all these bills we have brought in thus far at this session have come out of our committee by unanimous report. We have no partisanship in our committee because we are dealing with the security of our Nation, realizing that we all are in the same boat and we are going to sink or swim together.

This bill, of course, is highly important. The new weapons of modern warfare are terrifying. Pilotless planes and guided missiles, no doubt flying at invisible heights at supersonic speed, will be able to rain death and destruction from the sky. God forbid that we shall ever have to use them. While we want to keep ourselves strong on sea, land, and in the air, invincible to any attack from any quarter, I think we all would do well to work and pray for the cause of peace and do our best to create and develop a moral conscience of mankind whereby civilization shall not be destroyed by the instruments of our own hand.

As a member of the congressional delegation that visited the atrocity camps in the Reich 3 or 4 weeks before Germany surrendered, I visited a great underground factory at Nordhausen near Leipzig where the V-1 and V-2 bombs were being made, an underground factory with 33 miles of subterranean passages, comparable in magnitude and efficiency with the Ford plant at Willow Run or Boeing out in Seattle or Alcoa down in the Tennessee Valley. There we saw long assembly lines turning out those instruments of death and we saw the awful

havoc that they did at Antwerp and at London. We got there just in time. Those bombs, however, in the last war, were not under control after they were once fired. Their course and direction was limited from the spots where they were touched off, but now we are producing missiles that can be guided by radar, and in the course of their flight, can have their direction changed. Why, Nagasaki and Hiroshima were nothing compared to the scenes of awful suffering and indescribable misery that will be experienced in another global conflict.

We shall continue, as members of the Armed Services Committee, charged with the security of this Nation, to keep our country strong, but I think that perhaps we should put forth all of our efforts not only as Members of Congress, but as citizens of a great Nation and as members of the human family, to create a moral conscience in this world and not put all of our faith in "horses that run upon the rocks."

For our distinguished, lovable chairman, I want to say that each and every one of us on our committee love him, and we hope that the good people in Georgia will continue to exercise their hard sense and sound judgment in returning him to this body as long as he desires and in which he has served for over a third of a century, and to which he has made such a magnificent contribution.

God bless you, Carl.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have already had the responsibility of expressing myself in regard to H. R. 1741, which proposes the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles. Since this measure has been reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the House Committee on Armed Services, it is readily apparent that I fully support the measure. However, I want to take this additional opportunity to briefly voice my sentiments on the importance of the proposed legislation.

This is not a hastily prepared measure. On the contrary, it had its inception almost 3 years ago when the Joint Chiefs of Staff recognized the necessity for a testing range much longer than any existing facility. Even with the improved facilities which have been established within the last 3 years, we have no existing facility with which to test guided missiles at a range greater than 150 miles. We have been advised—and it is now a matter of public record—that guided missiles with ranges up to 500 miles will be ready for testing during 1949. Since we have no range upon which to test such missiles, we have arrived at the crossroads of our problem. We need to ask ourselves two questions: First, Is it in the best interest of our national defense to confine our endeavors to an improvement of guided missiles which have a maximum range of 150 miles? Second, Is it in the best interest of national defense to construct a guided-missiles range which will

permit us to exhaust all foreseeable potentialities of guided missiles?

I do not hesitate to endorse the second choice. We cannot remain static in the field of guided missiles at a time when it is universally known that our only potential enemy is making a maximum effort in this field. We must not only keep abreast of any other nation in this field, we must be the undisputed leaders. I fully realize that this undertaking will entail the expenditure of large sums of money, and I am as reluctant as anyone else to increase the heavy tax burden which our people already bear. However, I am firmly convinced that if we have any hope for a lasting peace that it is mandatory to maintain an adequate defense which necessarily entails the expenditure of large sums of money on undertakings of this character. When one considers the astronomical sums which our Nation spent in winning the last war, I believe the present expenditure is justified as an agency which will either help us maintain the present unsteady peace or defend ourselves in the event of another national emergency.

On that basis and with that hope, Mr. Chairman, I give my full support to the proposed legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the bill pending before the Committee now is in accordance with recommendation No. 71 of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress. I desire to quote one paragraph of the explanatory matter accompanying recommendation No. 71. It says:

Physical facilities required for transonic and supersonic research and development of aircraft and guided missiles are so expensive they can be furnished only by the Government. The NACA and the Research and Development Board are preparing a coordinated program of facilities required in the national interest. Since adequate research and development facilities are essential for continued United States aviation leadership, this plan should be expedited.

Mr. Chairman, I should have to be in favor of this bill, but I must here express certain doubts as to the wisdom, let us say, of giving such high priority to very long-range guided missiles, and I do so in the light of the recent experiments I mentioned earlier in connection with another bill, the experiments at Eglin Field, Fla., which indicated the great difficulty that pursuit ships will have in the interception of high-altitude aircraft which may be advancing upon the United States. It would seem to me that the results of those tests would indicate quite clearly that a far more important program than the one now before us is the program of research and development in the ground-to-air missiles. I say that because with the increasing speeds and altitudes of aircraft carrying bombs which may approach the United States it is quite apparent that it will be necessary to have something other than manned aircraft to intercept them. We do now have in the primer stage, almost, a guided missile which can be sent from

the ground, guided by ground radar, to a certain point.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. May I point out to the gentleman that in the statement of Dr. Karl T. Compton before the subcommittee he indicated that under this bill provisions are made for four types of guided missiles—surface to surface, surface to air, air to air, and air to surface, which I think covers the point raised by the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. I agree that that is part of the program, but I feel strongly that the important thing we have to consider now is the interceptor type of missile, much more so than the attack type of missile. The interceptor-type missile is about the only thing that can with certainty do the job of intercepting a high-flying, fast-flying bomber directed against the United States. That has been practically proven in the tests conducted at Eglin Field. I believe that while it is nice to know that you can send missiles 2,500 miles—we have never been able to do it yet, but we may—and it will be nice to know that when the times comes, the important thing today is to develop the interceptor type of missile, a missile which can remain under control until the missile itself, through its own radar, can make contact with an oncoming vessel, either in the air or on the sea, and then release itself from ground control and control its own path with an integral electronic computer system which will direct it to the point of interception, and there, by other means which were known during the past war, explode itself in the vicinity of the attacking airplane.

I hope and trust that the funds that are to be expended by the Research and Development Board will be expended in this direction, not to the exclusion, perhaps, of these other plans, but to a degree whereby such a missile may be perfected and placed in production in the shortest possible time. This is vitally important to the defense of our country and to the discouragement of attacks against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and that amendments be in order at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to establish a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, within or without the continental limits of the United States, for scientific study, testing, and training purposes by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized in discharging the authority given in the preceding section to make surveys, to acquire lands and rights or other interests pertaining thereto, including the

temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, in administering the provisions of the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654, 43 U. S. C., Supp. 315q).

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed \$200,000,000 to carry out the purposes of sections 1 and 2 of this act.

Sec. 4. The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are hereby authorized to contribute to the support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons to the extent they may deem necessary or advisable, including, but not limited to, the allocation for such support of funds available to them for such purposes.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of Defense may, at his discretion, transfer and reallocate to any department, board, or agency within the National Military Establishment all, or any part of the authority granted herein, and, in connection with such transfer or reallocation, may transfer all or any part of the funds available for the establishment or support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "\$200,000,000" and insert "\$75,000,000."

Page 2, line 19, after "reallocate" strike out the remainder of line 19 and all of line 20, and insert "to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force all, or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KARSTEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 128, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include as part of my remarks a statement by Dr. Karl T.

Compton, Chairman, Research and Development Board. This statement was made before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Armed Services Committee of the House on February 14, 1949. It deals with the subject of H. R. 1741, a bill authorizing the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles.

Dr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, since the research, development, and test of guided missiles is a comparatively new field, I will start my discussion by explaining a few of the terms that are in daily usage in this work. First, what is a guided missile? The currently accepted definition is that it is "an unmanned vehicle moving above the earth's surface, whose trajectory or flight path is capable of being altered by a mechanism within the vehicle."

By mutual consent, the services have further subdivided guided missiles into four categories according to the manner of launching and the location of target. These are: Surface-to-surface, surface-to-air, air-to-air, and air-to-surface. A surface-to-surface guided missile, for example, is one which is launched from the ground or from a ship and is thence steered during its flight to strike its distant target, which may be an enemy ship or factory or other military objective on the ground or sea. An air-to-surface missile would be one launched from an airplane against a target on the surface of the earth, either on land or sea, and moving or stationary. Note particularly that we do not include ordinary bombs, shells, or bullets, as these missiles do not incorporate an internal mechanism to influence their trajectory.

The proving ground under discussion today is required primarily for the completion of research and development work on guided missiles with ranges greater than 150 miles, for which no facility now exists in this country. There are other requirements for this facility, however, as will be brought out by General Richardson.

To further explain guided missiles as compared to conventional shells or bombs, and at the risk of oversimplification, let us consider the action of these two types of missiles. The artillery shell or bullet is fired from a gun at a high velocity. After firing, it is influenced only by atmospheric conditions and gravity. The airplane bomb, after it leaves the plane, is affected only by the motion of the plane at launching, the atmosphere, and gravity. In both cases, accuracy of the initial aim plus prediction of atmospheric conditions and possible movement of the target are the factors that determine a hit or miss.

The guided missile, on the other hand, usually has incorporated in it a motor which takes over after launching and accelerates the missile or continues it at a constant speed for an extended period of time, thereby increasing its range. Various internal mechanisms may be used to provide guidance and control to the missile while in flight. These mechanisms are controlled in various ways by outside influences, such as by radio or radar, as one example. The missile may have some kind of seeing eye which automatically steers it to its target after it has come within a few miles of its objective.

By these means, a missile can fly a predetermined course to a target, recognize it, and make final alterations to its course, in order to deliver the warhead within the target area. All this will be done eventually at supersonic speeds to reduce the possibility of enemy defense against it. I hasten to say that this oversimplified description of a guided missile is, in no sense, what we have today, but is what we are working toward. At the same time, however, I will state that none of the features so briefly described are considered insurmountable by American sci-

ence, and all are in an encouraging state of development.

A test range is an area within which the experimental guided missiles can be tested in flight to study their over-all performance and the behavior of all their parts: wings, motors, electronic equipment, rudders, stabilizers, etc. By such tests, faults can be identified and corrected, adjustments perfected, and alternative methods of operation compared. Without the benefit of such tests, the manufactured missiles would be so unreliable that the money spent on their development would be largely wasted.

An important term that is used repeatedly in connection with test ranges is instrumentation. This term is applied to the integrated system of devices used at a range to acquire the test data. One function or element of the instrumentation system is called telemetering, which may be described as the transmission of data from the missile to the ground by electrical means. It is essential that the scientist who is developing a missile know exactly what is happening within it at all times. Telemetering data tell us how engines, control surfaces, and other mechanisms of the missile are functioning, and whether the missile is rolling, tumbling, or deviating from its course. These data are picked up at various ground instrumentation stations located at intervals along the predicted flight path.

If I might interpolate just a bit into my prepared statement, I would like to use this illustration. You all know the instrumentation panel which is in front of a pilot of an airplane, which gives the performance of the motor, his compass, and all the details that he needs to know about the functioning of the instruments. It is by means of the readings on those instruments that he properly controls his craft.

Well, now, in a guided missile, there is no pilot there who can see those things, but it is necessary to have that same kind of information. So the instruments are put in the guided missile; but, instead of having the pilot in the guided missile to look at the instruments, all the readings of those instruments are sent down by some kind of radio control to the ground and reproduced on instruments at the ground so that the observer on the ground sees what is going on in the plane just as if he was sitting in the cockpit of a guided missile and looking at the instruments themselves. That is the telemetering device.

In addition to the telemetering receivers at each station, special electronic instruments are necessary to track the missile throughout its flight to continually indicate its position in space, as well as high-speed cameras to take pictures of the launching and early part of the flight.

At the conclusion of a flight, a study of the data thus obtained gives a complete picture of what happened to the missile during its entire flight. Even the simplest missile, made to test a particular component of the finished product, costs many thousands of dollars. The more complicated may well run into the hundreds of thousands. This reason, alone, makes it absolutely essential for both economy and success that a flight-test range have adequate instrumentation to produce the data necessary in the experimental work connected with the development of guided missiles.

You are undoubtedly interested in the question of the hazard to people and property, and the interference with private and commercial interests, in connection with the test flying of missiles on the proposed range. In the minds of the uninitiated, the danger element has been greatly exaggerated; the mere mention of guided missiles conjures up visions of death and destruction. Actually the danger in this case will be very small, because every possible precaution will be taken to make it so. The test mis-

siles will not have explosive warheads; they will have means to dispose of them in the air, over a safe area, if they deviate too far off course. They will normally fly so high that it will be impossible to detect them without special instruments. From a safety standpoint, they will be no more dangerous than a conventional airplane flying overhead; from a nuisance standpoint, they will be less objectionable. Most important of all, the test range will be located in a region so sparsely inhabited, in the areas where there might be any danger, that the hazard will be wholly negligible.

I have tried to give you a brief picture of a guided missile from the point of view of the scientist who is developing it, some of the terms used, and the essentials of a test range. We who have been associated with the guided-missile field from its inception are convinced that weapons such as I have described, with ranges in the hundreds of miles and accuracies acceptable to the military, can be developed. To develop them, we must have a range on which to test them. The need is urgent. Actually, the guided-missile development program is one of our largest research and development programs, and hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of the results of this work are becoming dependent on the availability of such a test range. As so often happens, we will need this facility before it is in operation even if work were started on it today, as we are rapidly outgrowing existing facilities.

I do not mean by that that the existing ranges are becoming obsolete. On the contrary, I cannot visualize the time when we will not need the three existing smaller ranges. However, none of them permit expansion in length; and we are in dire need of a facility that can meet all of our foreseeable needs in the field of the long-range guided missiles.

I have purposely kept my discussion in general terms and left the presentation of detailed information to General Richardson. As already mentioned, this project has been critically studied by the experts of the Committee on Guided Missiles of the Research and Development Board, and unanimously approved by them and by the Board.

Thank you.

HOUSING AND RENT ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 138, Rept. No. 243), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 5 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in

the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COFFEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. FUGATE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Greenfield Reporter.

PALESTINE REFUGEES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 139, Rept. No. 244), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 36) for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time this afternoon in order to present a few facts and make a few pertinent comparisons in the interest of getting the record straight.

A great many of our Republican friends have remarked recently that the Eighty-first Congress has been slow in getting any action on legislation. In order to keep the record straight, I simply want to point out that during the first 2 months of the Eighty-first Congress 12 bills have been enacted into law, compared with 8 that were enacted into law during the same period in 1947 when the Eightieth Congress convened on January 3.

This record, Mr. Speaker, includes the first 2 months of both the Eightieth and

the Eighty-first Congress through the date of February 28 in each year.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the House passed in the first 2 months of the present session, exclusive of bills on the Private Calendar, 15 bills in addition to those that have had action completed on them in both Houses and have become law. In the same period 2 years ago the Republican House passed only seven legislative measures, exclusive of those written into law.

Among the 12 laws enacted in January and February of this year were those extending the authority of the President to enter into voluntary agreements providing for the allocation of certain scarce materials and commodities; legislation providing for export controls; for the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate ships. Other laws that have been enacted include appropriations for relief of disaster victims in the blizzard areas.

The promptness with which this Congress moved to meet the emergency in the recent western storm area reflects credit, I think, upon our legislative processes. Fifteen other measures passed by the House and sent to the other body during the first 2 months of this year included the Government Reorganization Act of 1949. That is the act which permits the President to bring about economies and greater efficiency in the Federal Establishment, and to put into effect many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Included also in bills that have passed this House and have gone to the other body is a bill extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, a basic essential in our foreign policy, a bill that has been called by Cordell Hull the very keystone of our foreign policy.

Other bills passed by the House and sent to the Senate include a bill extending the War Assets Administration, a bill covering the export of copper, and a bill covering cotton acreage planting.

All those bills referred to do not include numerous actions taken by the House necessary to the organization of Congress. Of course, both political parties had those problems. In the early days of the Eightieth Congress, when the Republican Party took over, of course they had to reorganize the Congress. The same thing was true when the Democratic Party took over on January 3 of this year.

My good friend, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.], said a few days ago—and I have the newspaper clipping in my possession—that this was a “no-can-do” Congress. Evidently he was resorting to some fiction and not fact in making such a statement, or at least the chairman had not compared the record of the Eightieth Congress up through February 28 with the record of the Eighty-first Congress for the same period this year.

The record shows that this Congress accomplished more in the first 2 months of this session than did the Eightieth Congress in the first 2 months under the Republican administration.

Legislation is coming from committees and now scheduled with full programs ahead for every day of every week. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a tabulation of some of those bills. I simply want to refer to them so that the record on this point at least can be correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I might observe, before asking the question, that it occurs to me the gentleman is protesting too much. How many of these bills to which the gentleman has referred have actually become law?

Mr. PRIEST. There have been 12 that actually have become law compared to 8 up to February 28 of 1947.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the gentleman referred to the allocation of materials and other things that had to do with price control; that was just an extension of legislation passed in the Eightieth Congress, was it not?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; that was, but it was legislative action by the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right, and then the legislation to which the gentleman referred, extending the power of the Maritime Commission to operate ships; that was just an extension of what was done in the Eightieth Congress, was it not?

Mr. PRIEST. With some modification, I believe.

Mr. HALLECK. And the relief of copper from import duties; was not that just an extension of what was done in the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. PRIEST. I believe with some modification; yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Those are three.

Mr. PRIEST. Those are three.

Mr. HALLECK. And the control of exports from the United States with some slight modification was just an extension of what was done in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. PRIEST. As I recall the legislation it would go perhaps a little beyond being a slight modification; it was almost new legislation on that subject, but it was one of the bills that has been enacted into law; that is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Included in the 12 measures to which the gentleman refers, one was the measure which the gentleman does not specifically mention, raising the President's salary.

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; that was one.

Mr. HALLECK. And did the gentleman include in the 12 accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress to date the enactment of legislation providing for the 4-day holiday for public employees?

Mr. PRIEST. If the gentleman will just permit; I am happy to continue to yield, but I will read at this point each one of the 12 bills that have been enacted during the first 2 months of the Eighty-first Congress and follow that by reading a list of the laws enacted during the first 2 months of the Eightieth Congress. I believe that is the best way to get the record straight.

Now, as to the bills enacted into law during the first 2 months of the Eighty-

first Congress, they are shown by the following table:

BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS IN THE FIRST 2 MONTHS

Public Law 1 (S. J. Res. 16): Federal employees, holiday. Approved January 18, 1949.

Public Law 2 (S. 103): President, Vice President, Speaker of House of Representatives, salary increases. Approved January 19, 1949.

Public Law 3 (H. J. Res. 112): Appropriations disaster relief. Approved January 28, 1949, appropriating \$500,000 for emergency relief in Western blizzard area.

Public Law 4 (H. J. Res. 88): Railroad equipment, free entry, amend. (Merci train.) Approved February 3, 1949.

Public Law 5 (H. J. Res. 136): Appropriations, disaster relief. Approved February 7, 1949. Five hundred thousand dollars for disaster relief in blizzard area.

Public Law 6 (S. 547): Prices, stabilization of, amend. Approved February 9, 1949. Continues through September 30, 1949 authority of the President to make voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, and speculative trading in commodities which basically affect the cost of living.

Public Law 7 (H. R. 2402): War Assets Administration, continue. Approved February 21, 1949.

Public Law 8 (H. R. 1252): Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, amend. Provided that professional staff of congressional committees may be hired by executive branch of Government when such persons are terminated from committee staff. Approved February 24, 1949.

Public Law 9 (S. 492): Stamps, commemorative, Alexandria, Va.

Public Law 10 (S. 713): General Accounting Office, building, increase limit of cost.

Public Law 11 (S. 548): Export Control Act of 1949. Approved February 26, 1949, extends until June 30, 1951, the authority of the President to control exports.

Public Law 12 (H. J. Res. 92): To continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels. Signed February 28, 1949.

I have here a list of the eight laws enacted by the Eightieth Congress during the first two months, from January 3 to February 28, 1947:

BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, IN THE FIRST 2 MONTHS

Public Law 1 (S. J. Res. 3): Senate, employee, approved January 31, 1947.

Public Law 2 (H. J. Res. 57): Alcohol plants, produce sugars, approved February 1, 1947.

Public Law 3 (S. J. Res. 4): Senate, employees compensation, approved February 19, 1947.

Public Law 4 (S. J. Res. 24): Senate, committee, staff organization. Approved February 19, 1947.

Public Law 5 (H. R. 1353): National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, amended. Approved February 21, 1947.

Public Law 6 (H. J. Res. 114): Maritime Commission, vessels. Approved February 26, 1947.

Public Law 7 (H. J. Res. 121): United Nations, gift taxes. Approved February 26, 1947.

Public Law 8 (S. 568): Agriculture, foot-and-mouth disease. Approved February 28, 1947.

Those are the eight bills that were completely enacted into law on which the legislative process had been completed up to February 28, 1947, compared to the 12 I have just read.

I have here also, and I shall ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD, a list of the 15 bills on which House ac-

tion has been completed up to that time this year and the 7 bills on which House action had been completed prior to February 28 of 1947.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the gentleman from Tennessee, the distinguished whip of the majority party, is entitled to a vote of thanks for bringing the record up to date. I should like to call his attention to the fact that the Republicans made arrangements for an inaugural in January of this year which caused us a loss on this side. We have had to take that added burden but in spite of it we have been able to show a better record to date than the Republican Party did over a similar period 2 years ago.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the chief assistant majority whip of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I also call attention to the bills that have passed the House and are now over in the Senate. Two of them are very important bills.

There is the reorganization bill which passed the House in one day. I do not remember of a reorganization bill ever having passed the House with less than one week's debate. I remember the first reorganization bill that came up in this body years ago. It was adopted by the committee after 3 weeks debate, then recommitted. Here is a bill that passed the House in 1 day providing permanent legislation.

In the same week we passed a reciprocal trade agreements bill in 2 days. Ordinarily I should say that either one of those bills would take a week.

Mr. Speaker, this is all due to the very fine Democratic organization that exists in the House and in great part to the wisdom of the voters last fall in sending to this body close to 100 new Democratic Members who are the tops so far as I am concerned.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I have here a list of these bills. My purpose in taking the floor today was simply to get into the RECORD some facts. I was a newspaper man for 14 years before coming to this body and having been a newspaper man I believe in facts. A great deal has been said pro and con about the slowness of operation of the Eighty-first Congress and I wanted some facts in the RECORD to show what has happened and some comparison of what happened during a similar period in 1947.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include as a part of my remarks a list of bills enacted and a list of bills enacted by the House but on which action has not been completed during both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

OTHER BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, IN THE FIRST 2 MONTHS

H. R. 54: Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. (Awaits signature of President.)

H. R. 128: Agriculture, cotton acreage. (Conference.)

H. R. 164: California, Churntown Elementary School District.

H. R. 858: Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, amends. It would exclude from the regular rate of pay, for purposes of overtime computation, premiums paid for Saturday, Sunday, and holiday work and for work at undesirable hours.

H. R. 967: El Paso, Tex. (private bill).

H. R. 1211: Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949. Extends the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to June 12, 1951, and eliminating amendments written into the act by the Eightieth Congress.

H. R. 1243: Hatch Act, amend, penalty. Relates to governmental employees who engage in political activity. Under the present law the penalty is automatic discharge. The bill permits the Civil Service Commission to fix the penalty.

H. R. 1401: Michigan, Mount Hope Cemetery Association.

H. R. 1998: Florida, Pinellas County, land description corrected.

H. R. 2101: Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Making \$44,000,000 in loans available to farmers in the western disaster area.

H. R. 2313: Copper, copper-bearing ores, exemption from import tax. Continues the suspension of import duties on copper for 2 years, until March 31, 1951.

H. R. 2361: Reorganization Act of 1949. Provides for the reorganization of the Federal Government.

H. R. 2632: Appropriations, first deficiency. Steam plant.

House Joint Resolution 84: Freedom Train, acquisition. Authorizing the Government to operate the Freedom Train for 2 years at a cost of \$2,500,000. Now awaits signature of President.

House Joint Resolution 85: Inauguration tax, admission tickets.

H. R. 4: Failure to bring a person under arrest before a committing officer within the proper time shall not render evidence admissible. Passed House February 24, 1947.

H. R. 597: Prevents disposition of garbage in Territorial waters of the United States. Passed House February 10, 1947, and later was pocket vetoed.

House Joint Resolution 27: Amendment to Constitution. Limiting Presidential tenure to two terms. Passed House February 6, 1947.

House Joint Resolution 122: United States Maritime Commission, Alaska Ocean Service. Passed House February 18, 1947.

H. R. 2157: Courts, limit jurisdiction. Overtime-pay suits must be commenced 1 year after date of accrual. Passed House February 28, 1947.

H. R. 1030: Continues in effect certain war excise taxes. Passed House January 29, 1947.

H. R. 1968: Urgent deficiency appropriation bill. Passed House February 18, 1947.

THE RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am not a little amazed to discover here today that my very amiable and fine friend from Tennessee, the majority whip, has

deemed it necessary to come down here in the well of the House and undertake to explain why so little legislation has been passed by the Eighty-first Congress. That he would deem it necessary to make any sort of explanation or comparison at all seems to me to get him very close to the point where he must have something of a guilty conscience.

I was not too sure as I listened to the interruption by the majority leader, my very good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], whether he was endeavoring to take credit for what had been accomplished or to commend the Republicans who have cooperated, certainly in the passage of the reorganization bill to which he referred.

First of all, in respect to the Eightieth Congress, I may say to my friend from Tennessee that for him to compare the Eighty-first Congress with the Eightieth Congress is to make a comparison with a Congress that did a magnificent job for the people of the country. I am glad to see that he apparently recognizes that, because he wants to put his comparison on that basis.

Now, among other reasons for my conviction in that regard is the fact that when the Eightieth Congress came into being and convened in Washington, it fell to our lot to put into effect the provisions of the Reorganization Act that had been enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress. It was a tremendous job to shrink the committees from 48 to 19; to bring about the complete reorganization of committees; to staff those committees under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, and to carry into full force and effect every line of the Reorganization Act.

I have said before, and I say it again, that if the Eightieth Congress had not been a Republican Congress, the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act would never have been put into effect. Now, enough for that.

Let me say just this: In my opinion this attempted apology for the record of the Eighty-first Congress to this date is nothing more than a smoke screen to cover up the very obvious fact that none of the pledges made to the people in the last campaign, as to what would be done in this Congress, have as yet been carried out. Now, it would appear to me just as a bystander that over on the other side of the Capitol Mr. Truman seems to be filibustering his own program. I do not know how soon they will be able to move forward with the accomplishment of any of the promises that have been made.

Here in the House the plain fact remains that old hands are at the wheel. In other words, you have on the Democratic side in the Eighty-first Congress old hands with experience in the Seventy-ninth and preceding Congresses, who just moved back into the chairs they previously held and yet, in these upward of 2 months, as I said before, none of the significant, important pledges made to the American people have as yet been accomplished.

I hazard this prediction, too, from what I have been able to see around, that very few of those pledges are finally going to be enacted into law. I think if

you get down to it, that is the real reason for this attempted apology today. Certainly, no one of experience in this Chamber would otherwise get very excited about any one statement about a no-can-do Congress. Why, we took that criticism on our side during the Eightieth Congress. I sometimes think that over here you can dish it out but you cannot take it. I recall how you complained about the inaction of the Eightieth Congress. Well, we did not pay any attention to it. We knew that we could accomplish everything that we had promised the American people and we did accomplish that program. We got to it in an orderly way. We held careful hearings and the legislation was enacted into law. Yes, may I remind you again, the most significant parts of that program were enacted into law with more Democratic votes for them than against them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. The generosity and kindness of my friend from Massachusetts overwhelms me. I have a slight feeling that he is getting ready to make a speech himself, and I hope he does. I hope he does, as I would like to hear him predict just what is going to be accomplished in connection with this promised program. Maybe he is going to tell us about the pension bill that, under this new rule adopted by the Eighty-first Congress, seems likely to come up next Monday although, as I understand, the Committee on Rules has not yet voted out a rule.

I inquired here on the floor the other day about whether the chairman of the Committee on Rules, my very dear friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] could tell us what the President's attitude is about that pension bill. The President has advised us about everything else that is up here in the way of a legislative suggestion. I had not heard anything about that pension bill, although I did see that yesterday, according to the press this morning, the new Director of the Budget was up here testifying in opposition to the pension bill, so I would assume that the President is opposed to the pension bill.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Indiana if he will urge the leadership on his side to support the so-called Rankin bill?

Mr. HALLECK. My recollection is that the gentleman from Ohio was one of the Members on the Democratic side in the Eightieth Congress who was constantly upbraiding the Rules Committee because they did not bring out more bills for the veterans, when the fact of the matter is that the Eightieth Congress enacted 188 different bills of direct bene-

fit to the veterans—one of the best programs for the veterans ever enacted by any Congress. So I am not to be dissuaded by the gentleman's interrogation of me in that regard. I am wondering on my part whether or not he is going to challenge the position of the Bureau of the Budget as the official spokesman of the executive branch of the Government in respect to the position it has taken on this pension matter.

The other day at that dinner held here in the District, it was reported in the press—I did not get an invitation to the dinner so I was not there—the President said that the Republicans in Congress were blocking the accomplishment of his program. The majority leader has just referred to the 100 new Democrats who have come here to swell the ranks on the Democratic side. Why, we Republicans are down to 171 Members. You have all the rest of them out of 435. You have a great majority in the other branch of the Congress. Now, how in heaven's name does it stand to reason that the Republicans are blocking the accomplishment of this great "pie in the sky" that was offered the people in the last campaign?

Speaking only for myself, I would like to believe that there was sufficient strength among the Republicans to block a considerable part of this program that has been proposed, because I happen to think that a lot of it ought to be blocked. And, again I say, it is going to be blocked because there are enough Democrats in the Congress who put the welfare of their country, its solvency, and the freedom of the people ahead of political promises or political expediency. They are going to see to it that a lot of that program is not enacted into law.

THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when I asked for the additional 5 minutes for my distinguished friend from Indiana, I had no intention of making any remarks, because nothing my friend said caused the spirit in me to move in the slightest, but as a result of the additional time the gentleman obtained he did make a few statements that did cause the spirit to move and prompted me to seek recognition.

My friend seems to place a great deal of emphasis on the liberalization of the rule. May I say to him that he had better study that rule, as well as some other rules, a little more and then he will not leave himself open to a devastating come-back in relation to a pension bill coming up under only one rule. Other than that, I have no observation to make. If he will confer with his friend to the right, the gentleman from Illinois might be able to advise him further. I make that suggestion to him out of the very extreme kindness of my mind and heart, as I do not want my good friend the gentleman from Indiana to make too many misstatements.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thought that we might explore that question of the rule a little bit further. Does the gentleman mean the Committee on Veterans' Affairs can bring up a pension bill at any time if they so desire?

Mr. McCORMACK. A general pension bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the Committee on Veterans' Affairs bring up a bill at any time if they so desire, under the rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. It has a privileged status, the same as the appropriation bills or tax bills.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I believe that probably the gentleman from Mississippi would appreciate that information.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I must yield first to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who is on his feet.

Mr. RANKIN. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is correct in saying that pension legislation is privileged. But since the eclipse of the Committee on Rules, we also have the right to move on next Monday, or on Monday 2 weeks from now, to bring the rule up on the floor of the House under the new rule, whether it is privileged legislation or not. On those Mondays we are permitted to move, under the rule, to call up the rule after it has been introduced 21 days.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is under the rule as amended this session.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct, but I was not referring to that. I was referring to something else.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, he also said that the gentleman could bring it up tomorrow if he wished.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman had better read the rules a little more. However, my remarks were not directed to the gentleman from Massachusetts, but were directed to my good friend the gentleman from Indiana, because I do not want to see him embarrassed in the future.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thought the entire membership would like to have the same information that the gentleman possessed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to see my friend from Indiana embarrassed in the future, when he says that pension legislation can only come up under one rule. The rules are there for anyone to read. An appropriation bill does not need a rule, if there is no legislation attached to it. A tax bill does not need a rule. If the gentleman will look up the rules, he will find that there are some others that do not need rules.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For the enlightenment and information of the gentleman from Massachusetts, as well as the Members of the House, the special rule to which he has alluded does provide that if the Committee on Rules fails

to report out a rule requested by the chairman of a committee having charge of the legislative bill which has been reported to that committee within 2 calendar days, then on the second and fourth Mondays of each month the chairman of that legislative committee may call up his rule for consideration. That is, he may call up the rule which he has submitted to the Committee on Rules, and the Chair shall recognize the gentleman for that purpose. However, in this particular case, the rule which would be called up under that special rule by the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, would be a closed rule, providing, of course, that the Committee on Rules does not grant a rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has said nothing which is inconsistent with what I have said.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] have five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, that shows the spirit of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the purpose of the gentleman from Tennessee was not to offer an apology, but to make the record straight to show what has happened to date in the Eightieth Congress and the Eighty-first Congress.

My Republican friends, in their desperation, have been making some statements which are rather far-removed from the true facts. It is only the Republican mind that could place such an interpretation upon it, when a Democrat takes the floor and presents the facts, particularly when it is uncomfortable to our Republican friends, that he is undertaking to make an apology.

I can remember last session. We did not attack the Republican Party at the outset because of its failure to function because we realized that it takes at the outset of a Congress at least 2 weeks for committees to be formed. We are all practical men and we know that. For the Democrats to attack the Republicans in the last Congress when they were in control for taking about 2 weeks to have the committees formed would not have been right. It would not have been fair and we did not do it. After the committees are formed, it then takes about 10 days or 2 weeks to internally organize and to get their bills assigned for hearings. So that the practical operation, when a new Congress meets, no matter what the Congress be, whether it is Republican controlled or Democratic controlled, we who have had some experience know that it takes from 4 to 6 weeks before a new Congress actually starts functioning. That is what happened 2 years ago and that is what is happening now.

Some of our Republican friends have been making some statements and speeches—even my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] made one down in South Carolina, as I remember, some weeks ago. Of course, I knew that Joe had departed from the role of statesman and was talking as a true Republican, attacking the Democratic-controlled Congress for having passed only one bill—a bill increasing the salary of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker. In that case my friend knew that bill had to be passed on or before January 20. Otherwise any increase for the President would not have become effective during the term of the present President of the United States, and we were all unanimous in having a proper increase in salary for the President of the United States. Both sides cooperated, but that bill had to be enacted into law, as I remember it, on or before January 20, when President Truman assumed his present term of office.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not say that my statement was not correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no. I say the gentleman discolored it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In what way did I discolored it?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made the statement that we had done nothing, when the record shows we have done more to date than the Eightieth Congress, of which my friend from Massachusetts was the leader of the Republican Party and the Speaker of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman said in his South Carolina talk—

Mr. McCORMACK. Was it South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It was South Carolina. The gentleman said there were two bills passed and one of them was an increase in the pay of the President. Is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. McCORMACK. When did the gentleman make that speech?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. At 7 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thought my friend from Massachusetts retired about 7 o'clock at night. In any event, I meant what date? Of course, 7 o'clock is rather late for my friend. But what date was it?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not recall.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman know that it takes 2 weeks when a new Congress meets for the committees to be formed?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does it not take 10 days or 2 weeks thereafter for the committees to organize? Is that not right?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I remember the gentleman stood on this floor and said you were going to bring

the wage-hour bill out in 1 day, January 18, and you have not brought it out yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but that is due to the fact that the Republican members of the committee are not cooperating. Any kind of a real extension of the wage-hour law, from 40 cents to 75 cents, will not come out of the committee through any assistance of any Republican member, with the possible exception of one. I hope there will be one, but I doubt it. In any event, however, the fact remains that the Eighty-first Congress, stating the record in response to the inaccurate statement made by Republican leaders, is far ahead. The final answer will be the end of the Congress. The people of the United States gave a vote of commendation of this Democratic Congress when they overwhelmingly repudiated the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress last November.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file a report and minority views on the bill (S. 135) relating to daylight-saving time in the District.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include a report of the Soil Conservation District of Benton County. This report may exceed the limit a little; but, notwithstanding this, I ask consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

"THIS IS GREATER LAWRENCE" PROGRAM WINS NATIONAL RADIO AWARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, rating third place among the hundreds of radio stations in the United States for outstanding public service, WLAW, 50,000-watt affiliate of the American Broadcasting Co. at Lawrence, Mass., takes justifiable pride in its achievement.

Official notification wired on March 6, 1949, to Fred A. Sullivan, promotion manager of WLAW, by Jerry Franken, radio and television editor of Billboard,

the Nation's outstanding amusement weekly magazine, stated:

WLAW has been awarded third place for clear-channel network affiliates in the public-service category of Billboard's eleventh annual radio and television promotion competition. Details will be published in the March 12 issue of Billboard. Heartiest congratulations.

Produced and directed by Chief Announcer Frederick P. Laffey, who is also a captain in the Military Intelligence Reserve, the program is heard every Thursday at 7:15 p. m. It is sponsored by the Pacific Mills of Lawrence, world famous as a producer of fine textile fabrics.

Stressing the voluntary and effective teamwork which knits together all the diverse elements into democratic unity, "This Is Greater Lawrence" is an inspiring program idea, expertly produced for reception in all American homes.

Communism will never divide us as long as we have such affirmative expressions of tolerance, of mutual faith, and of work-a-day fellowship as are revealed in this program of community understanding, a program which should be emulated by every radio station.

Lawrence is one of the most cosmopolitan industrial cities in the United States. Of its 84,000 residents, 22,000 are foreign-born. But there are no racial or religious tensions, thanks to the community spirit developed through constructive public-relations efforts of which Pacific's program is such a splendid example.

Representatives of organizations embracing all civic endeavors tell the stories of the roles they play in the life of this city. They tell of the accomplishments which have been realized toward the greater health, happiness, and prosperity of their fellow men. They plan for the higher goals of tomorrow.

Reaching out to the neighboring communities of Methuen, Andover, and North Andover, "This Is Greater Lawrence" weaves a living, vibrant pattern of democracy in action.

Ernest D. Walen, executive vice president of Pacific Mills; Irving E. Rogers, president of the company which owns and operates the broadcasting facilities; and Frederick P. Laffey, producer and director of the program—these are the men who merit the plaudits of their fellow citizens.

Hats off to an all-American public service from Lawrence, Mass.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WILLIAM L. PFIEFFER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for balance of week on account of death in family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 593. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

337. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for farm-type storage bins and the letters of compliance to the plan; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

338. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

339. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting an additional list of copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Committee on Banking and Currency. Part II, minority views on the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1757. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2235. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights," with respect to relaxation of provisions governing copyright of foreign works; with amendments (Rept. No. 238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 178. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic Games at Detroit, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 165. A bill to authorize

the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2373. A bill to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park; with amendments (Rept. No. 242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 138. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1731, a bill to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. Resolution for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 36, joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees; without amendment (Rept. No. 244). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 135. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; with amendments (Rept. No. 245). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2960. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 593. A bill for the relief of Hampton Institute; without amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 599. A bill for the relief of Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc., without amendment (Rept. No. 231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 735. A bill for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard; without amendment (Rept. No. 232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 766. A bill for the relief of John F. Galvin; with amendments (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy; without amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3234. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; without amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3254. A bill for the relief of Iva Gavin; without amendment (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Anna Malone; with amendments (Rept. No. 239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 3356. A bill to modify the plan for flood control in the Ohio River Basin approved by the act of June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3357. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3358. A bill to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 3359. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3360. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Cheyenne River compact as entered into under the act of February 26, 1927; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRIS (by request):

H. R. 3361. A bill relating to children born out of wedlock; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3362. A bill to amend sections 260, 267, 309, 315, 348, 350, and 361 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide that estates of decedents being administered within the probate court may be settled at the election of the personal representative of the decedent in that court 6 months after his qualification as such personal representative; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3363. A bill to amend section 16-418 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide that an attorney be appointed by the court to defend all uncontested annulment cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3364. A bill to amend section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the time within which a caveat may be filed to a will after the will has been probated; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3365. A bill to amend section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3366. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide a family allowance and a simplified procedure in the settlement of small estates; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3367. A bill to amend section 16-416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to conform to the nomenclature and practice prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3368. A bill to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3369. A bill to amend sections 130 and 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3370. A bill to amend section 16-415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for the enforcement of court orders for the payment of temporary and permanent maintenance in the same manner as directed to enforce orders for permanent alimony; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3371. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel to impoverished defendants in criminal cases in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3372. A bill to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for service of process on agents or employees of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation conducting a business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3373. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3374. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3375. A bill to authorize the construction of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital facility in Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 3376. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 526, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3377. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenues; and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 3378. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. D'EWARD:

H. R. 3379. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Indian Affairs to make and accept loans of road-building equipment; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3380. A bill to liberalize the delimiting marriage date in pension laws relating to certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the China Relief Expedition and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3381. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese treaty merchants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3382. A bill to allow a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of \$30 to a taxpayer who voted during the taxable year at any election in which a candidate was to be nominated or elected for Federal office; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 3383. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3384. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to suspensions of employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3385. A bill to require United States Civil Service Commission to establish regional office for State of Michigan at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3386. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3387. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3388. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3389. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3390. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3391. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3392. A bill to regulate the sale of reserved accommodations on passenger trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3393. A bill to create and establish an international university for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to provide for the course of study, management, and operation of the university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3394. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death while on 2 weeks' active duty, and for their

dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 3395. A bill to provide assistance for local-school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3396. A bill to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3397. A bill to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3398. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3399. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to more fully utilize the productive facilities of small-business concerns in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3400. A bill for the purpose of erecting adequate Federal office and postal facilities in Tacoma, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 3401. A bill to include the Virgin Islands in certain titles of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3402. A bill to amend section II of the act entitled "an act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special 3-cent postage stamp commemorative of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. Res. 140. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Annie O. Brown; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. Res. 141. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study public-opinion polls; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 142. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to investigate and study the circumstances surrounding the making of contracts and leases relating to golf courses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 143. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study the facts and circumstances relating to the obtaining of evidence in certain war-crime cases in Germany; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 144. Resolution for the relief of Jean Ness; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 3403. A bill for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3404. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Dugan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 3405. A bill for the relief of Vivian Newell Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3406. A bill for the relief of Leslie Fullard-Leo and Ellen Fullard-Leo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3407. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Ann Oliver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3408. A bill for the relief of Opal Hayes and D. A. Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3409. A bill to provide for the advancement of James Edgar Davis on the emergency officers' retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3410. A bill for the relief of Peter Kristian Kristensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 3411. A bill for the relief of George Konditsiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3412. A bill for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3413. A bill for the relief of Alfred Baumgarts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

185. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the State Legislature of State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to enact legislation permitting the coloring of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

186. Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will assure the payment of prices for farm products at not less than 100 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

187. Also, petition of Ralph R. Chapman, correspondent, and 26 other members of Local Branch 1225, National Association of Letter Carriers, Rapid City, S. Dak., veterans of World War II, requesting enactment of legislation to correct injustice of Public Law No. 134, enacted in July 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

188. By Mr. TOWNE: Petition of Hudson County Federation of Holy Name Societies, Jersey City, N. J., protesting against the outrageous procedure employed in the alleged trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

189. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Resolution of the Michigan State Legislature, protesting to the world the ruthless and unjust exercise of autocratic power in connection with the trial and conviction of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

190. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Associated Townsend Clubs of Pinellas County, Clearwater, Fla., requesting enactment of H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136, Eighty-first Congress, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, to whose kingdom of justice and love the future belongs: It is Thy might which hath made and preserved us a Nation. In the dedication of this quiet moment, perplexed by rushing cares, we would still all other voices that Thine may be heard.

We long to see the genuine spirit of brotherhood regnant in our common life—cleansing it from all that is unwholesome, sweetening every human relationship, composing the differences of class with class and nation with nation, delivering from the lust for gain or power or privilege which would narrow our loyalties and harden our sympathies. To this end we pray that Thou wouldst hear us for the outward growth of Thy kingdom in the world, and for its inward growth in our own hearts and consciences. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1741. An act to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3333. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.